January, 1935 Vol. XII. No. 1

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

## CONTENTS

PAGE

TRAINING FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP. Homer P. Rainey, Ph. D., LL. D. ..... 3

THE INDUCTION ADDRESS. Milton G. Evans, D. D., LL. D. ..... 12

TOWARD A FRESH AWARENESS OF GOD. James H. Franklin, D. D., LL. D. ..... 17

RELIGION IN THE JAPANESE MIND. Charles Hatch Sears ..... 29

AN EPISODE IN THE MESSIANIC HOPE. I. G. Matthews ..... 39

HEGEL'S INFLUENCE IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SITUATION. Edgar Sheffield Brightman ..... 47

THE TRANSFIGURATION—CREDENTIAL, OR ANSWER? W. P. Bradley, Ph. D., Sc. D. ..... 57

THE GENERAL HOSPITAL AS A CENTER FOR THE CLINICAL TRAINING OF THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS. Rev. Russell L. Dicks ..... 77

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 83

BOOK NOTICES ..... 107

BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 111

330344

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is published by the Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary, with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees. THE QUARTERLY aims to be a journal for the expression of theological opinion, embracing all the interests of students of religion, whether ministers, teachers, or laymen. It does not accept responsibility for the views expressed, publication indicating that the editors regard the articles as voicing opinions important enough to command attention.

A. STEWART WOODBURNE, Editor.
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager.

Remittances and business communications should be addressed to

THE BUSINESS MANAGER, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Editorial communications, contributions and books for review should be sent to

THE EDITOR, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

---

Subscription, $1.50 the year; single numbers, 40 cents

---

**Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by**
**THE JUDSON PRESS**
**Philadelphia, Pa.**

---

**Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.**

**Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.**

**Copyright, January, 1935, by Crozer Theological Seminary.**

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XII JANUARY, 1935 No. 1

## EDITORIAL NOTE

The first three articles which appear in this issue of THE CROZER QUARTERLY are the texts of the addresses delivered on the occasion of the inauguration of James H. Franklin, D. D., LL. D., as President of Crozer Theological Seminary, on Tuesday, October the ninth, nineteen hundred and thirty-four.

---

## TRAINING FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

**HOMER P. RAINEY, Ph. D., LL. D.**

**President, Bucknell University**

OCCASIONS such as this give us a fine opportunity to consider some of the basic issues and factors that are so urgent and so perplexing in our confused society. Crises in society inevitably lead to an inventory of our most fundamental social institutions, and to a careful scrutiny of our educational objectives and practices. In the last four or five years that process of subjecting all our institutions and practices to an acid test has been going on relentlessly. In our efforts to find the basic flaws in our social structure no institution or practice has escaped the searching eye of evaluation and criticism. The question-mark and the sceptical attitude have been our most familiar symbols in recent years. Democratic government, religion, education, morals and manners—all have been subjected to a withering blast of criticism that has been devastating in the extreme, but at the same time it has brought purging qualities which in the long run will, no doubt, give us better government, a more vital religion, a dynamic education, and a higher standard of morals and manners.

Our concern today is with the state of religion. All of us are thoroughly familiar with the plight of the Christian church—empty churches, funds declining almost to the vanishing point, closing mission fields at home and abroad, an indifference to moral and spiritual values, an unprecedented crime wave, the inability of the church to hold and interest the youth, and the lack of a vital message and appeal from the pulpit. The

result of all this is a confusion that is bewildering in the extreme. There is a Babel of tongues crying " Lo here " and " Lo there." A hundred and one panaceas and cure-alls have been suggested to lead us out of the slough of depression—I mean moral and spiritual depression. Parenthetically, I should like to register my firm conviction that when we have solved our moral and spiritual depression the economic clouds will, in a large measure, disappear. When we come to a full repentance for our sins, when we return to the supremacy of human, moral and spiritual values over those of material prosperity, excessive profits gained by graft, political exploitation, the sale of worthless securities to a gullible public whose chief aim in life is to get rich in the quickest manner possible and with whatever means at their disposal, when the moral conscience of the world will check the moral depravity of the international munitions makers and fomentors of wars, and when our Christian leaders have the moral courage to denounce these men as " dishonorable " and unworthy of a place in a Christian society, and when we let them know that they no longer can have the blessing of the church as moral support and cannot have our sons as cannon fodder, and when we tell them that they can no longer make a profit out of human carnage—when we have done some of these things then will there be a return of confidence and hope on the part of all men, and a large measure of security and happiness will be restored.

What has all this to do with a theological seminary and the inauguration of a new president? The answer is that it has everything to do with it. A theological seminary is in the profession of educating for Christian leadership. The objective of Christian leadership is to make our society Christian. It is the responsibility of our seminaries to make us a blue-print of a Christian society and furnish us with the methods and techniques for achieving it.

A theological seminary is, therefore, a professional school in the same sense as a school of law or medicine or engineering is a professional school. It deals with a particular area of experience. It has aims and objectives that are unique to it. Its methods and techniques are peculiar to itself. In other words, it has its own credentials, and must be judged by these credentials and no others. This fact should be stressed and clarified because I am convinced that much of our confusion in thinking and talking about religion misses the mark almost completely. I am certain that our so-called battle between science and religion is due to a failure to understand, on the one hand, what science is and, on the other hand, what religion is. Science is essentially a method of research or investigation—a method for the discovery of truth in any field of knowledge or experience. Religion is an area of human experience in which man searches for

truths just as he does in physics or chemistry. Now there are methods of investigation that are applicable to chemistry but are not applicable to economics or astronomy or history. Each of these areas of experience demands a distinct type of method of investigation which is peculiar to itself. The same principle is true of religion. Its subject-matter or content certainly differs from that of chemistry or astronomy. Whereas these subjects deal with material things religion deals only with the immaterial, such as attitudes, values, ideals, and spiritual experiences like prayer, faith, and relationships between the human spirit and the Infinite Spirit. It is reasonable, therefore, that two areas of experience so different in their content as chemistry and religion should also differ greatly in their techniques for the discovery of new experiences or the truths in their respective fields. Such is certainly the case. The effect of sincere prayer on the human spirit is an entirely different thing from the union of hydrogen and oxygen to produce water, and yet, the one is just as definitely a part of man's experience as the other. Furthermore, I venture to assert that the results in the one case are just as definite and predictable as in the other. When hydrogen and oxygen are combined under specified controlled conditions, water is always the result. When the conditions of the prayer life are observed just as carefully as the conditions under which hydrogen and oxygen unite to form water, then the spiritual effects upon a human spirit are definite and specific.

If these generalizations are true, they ought to help us a great deal to clarify our problem. In religion it becomes a matter of recognizing that it deals with a distinct, unique, and definite area of human experience, and beyond that point it becomes a matter of defining the field and exploring its depths with methods and techniques that are suitable and satisfactory to its requirements. Theology, therefore, is the tested or proven laws of experience in the area of religion. Chemical formulæ, such as $H_2O$ and $H_2SO_4$, are nothing more than the tested laws of chemical reaction. Our theology should arise in the same manner. It should be the result of tested experiences with the contents of religion. One's theology or religious creed should have the same relationship to one's intellectual life as one's acceptance of the laws of chemical reaction—each should be the result of tested experience.

What, then, are the functions of a theological seminary? Broadly speaking, I should say that it has two fundamental functions. The first is a research function. It should continuously be exploring this religious area of experience for new spiritual truths, and developing new and better methods for discovering new laws that operate in the spiritual universe. In the second place, it has a teaching function. It should train

leaders in these experiences and techniques so that they may go out and teach other men to live successfully and creatively the religious life.

What are the experiences included in this religious area of human activity? They are many and varied. As a matter of fact every human experience may, and does have religious significance in so far as one seeks to relate it to ultimate values and interprets it in terms of a life purpose. Religion enters into our experiences at the point where we begin to attach meaning to them. One writer has recently said that: "Once religion and life were one. It is a very significant fact that the word 'religion' does not once occur in the Old Testament. There was no need of the word, for everything was religious. In all primitive societies it was so. Law was simply the will of the gods. Morals were determined by religious taboos. Art was first occupied with carving semblances of the gods and decorating their shrines. Primitive man's love of rude rhythm was expressed vocally in repetitious hymns and bodily in monotonous prancings at festivals in honor of the deities. Hence came music and the dance. Drama's earliest appearance was in religious ritual. The remnants of early literature that have come down to us have uniformly been sacred books." For purposes of study we may say that one's theology is concerned with three great classes of facts: (1) the nature of the physical universe, (2) the nature of man, and (3) the nature of the society in which man is to live.

The history of all the great religions reveals how closely man's religious concepts have been related to, and dependent upon, his knowledge of the natural world in which he lived. Man has been controlled by the laws of the natural world, and his thinking about the nature of those laws and his relationship to them has always been a basic factor in his religious creed or theology. Much of man's religious ceremony has evolved out of his worship and glorification of nature—the sun, the moon, the mountains, and the rivers. A great deal of man's thinking and concepts about God or the maker of the universe has come from his knowledge of his world. This was inevitable and is expressed in the psalmist song:

> The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. . . In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.

And then immediately he made the transition in his thoughts to its religious significance when he said:

> The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart . . . the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

This is just as true today as when the psalmist sang. No small part of man's concept of God comes from what he knows of the marvelous wonders and beauty of his world. The power, wisdom, and omniscience of God are revealed in the galaxies of the starry world, and in the electrons and protons of the microscopic universe. Our world is still just as mysterious and wonderful as it was to the psalmist of old, and the God who made it is just as essential to our contemporary minds as he was to primitive man. He cannot be omitted from our theology any more than he could from his, and I doubt if, with our increased knowledge of the nature of the physical world, we have added much, if anything, to primitive man's concept of God. To him God was its creator. God was omnipotent. He was omniscient and omnipresent. There is not much that we can add to these concepts, except Christ's revelation of him as a loving father.

The second source of man's theology is the nature of man. What is man? Where did he come from? What is his destiny? Is his nature depraved or good? Is his nature at enmity with the God of the universe? If so, what are his means of salvation? What is man's relationship to the material universe and its creator? These and many other similar questions are basic in arriving at any satisfactory religious philosophy. Much of the tremendous power of the Calvinistic theology is due to the fact that it has a definite answer to each of these questions; and conversely, much of the lack of appeal of contemporary religion, in my humble opinion, is due to the fact that it has no satisfactory answer to these questions.

In the third place one's philosophy of religion is not complete until he has some adequate concept of the nature of society in which one is going to live and function in relationship to the laws of God which he knows. What kind of a human society does a just, righteous and loving God require of us? What are the goals to be sought? How shall we order our individual and collective lives in order that these goals may be realized? How are individuals related to God, and what are to be their proper relationships one to another? Are they equal before God, or shall one have power over another to oppress and exploit? Do race and nationality form limits for a Christian society, or are we to know neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor Barbarian, white nor black, brown nor yellow?

These are matters of vital significance in our religious experience. Man lives and moves and has his being in two worlds—the world of nature and the world of human society. His own nature is conditioned by each, and is relative to each. Furthermore, the nature of man is very flexible. He can live in the arctic or in the tropics. He can live in the desert or in the fertile valleys. He can accustom himself to live almost entirely on a diet of meat in the far north, or he can live on fruits and vegetables in

the warmer climates. In human society we find that human nature is capable of adapting itself to extremes that are equally as great as those which he encounters in nature. He can adapt himself to a cannibalistic society in which he eats human flesh. He can be happy in a society in which he throws his little ones to the crocodiles in the river. He can be led to engage in the slaughter of his fellow men by the millions in order to " make the world safe for democracy " or to rescue the Holy Land from the hands of unholy barbarians. On the other hand, he is capable of deeds of kindness and mercy that are Christlike. He can cooperate with his fellow man in achieving collectively great humanitarian ideals. He can be a savage or he can be a saint, and whether he is one or the other is not so much a question of his original nature as it is a matter of conditioning that nature by the society in which it operates.

Here we find ourselves at the basis of some of the most important issues of contemporary society. We hear almost every day the argument that certain social systems cannot succeed because they run counter to human nature, and we hear others defended on the grounds that they operate in accord with man's basic nature. To be specific, we are told that rivalry and competition are fundamental human instincts. In a society organized to glorify rivalry and competition it would certainly seem so. It has not occurred to us that, perhaps, we have confused cause and effect. Certainly man is competitive in a society in which his very life depends upon competition and in which all the rewards are made on that basis. We are told that Christ's exhortation to love our neighbors as ourselves is impossible of realization. Certainly it is impossible in a society in which one's neighbor is one's competitor and thus a potential enemy. We also hear a great deal about certain methods and systems destroying human initiative. We lose sight of the fact that the end or goal sought is far more important in determining initiative than are the means that may be employed in arriving at that goal. In this connection we might learn a great deal from the game of football. Is individual initiative lessened or heightened by the necessity for each player to forget himself and his personal desires, and to cooperate with ten other men and a coach to realize a group objective? Is this regimentation? Certainly. In its most extreme form. Is it inconceivable, therefore, that a nation of people who love football passionately will lose their initiative in cooperating for the realization of a great national ideal? I submit to you that the most powerful initiative that men have ever shown has been inspired by their passion to labor for an ideal wholly apart from themselves. If this is not true then the cross of Christ is meaningless and the whole Christian ideal is a sham.

All of these concepts are essential considerations in arriving at the true function of a theological seminary. I have been trying to indicate something of the field in which religion operates. An adequate theology or philosophy of religion must explain these three "natures"—the nature of the physical universe, the nature of man, and the nature of society in which man is to live, and it must go farther and explain their interrelationships. They involve the concept of God or the Infinite; the nature of man and his relationship to this cosmos; the relationship of man to man—a social philosophy, or a set of social goals toward which the nature of man is to be directed. Hence, education for Christian leadership must direct our lives and thought into an adequate synthesis of all these great fields and must, on the basis of this knowledge, provide organized religion with a working program. The inevitable implication of this truth is that the training required for Christian leadership must be comprehensive and thorough. Religion cannot succeed in an intelligent world with uneducated or half-educated leaders. In order that he may lead most effectively a Christian minister should be the best-educated man in his community. He needs to be a combination of natural scientist, social scientist, philosopher, and prophet. In the first two of these three fields he need not be a creator of knowledge or research scientist. He can draw upon the knowledge discovered by leaders in these fields. It is in the realm of prophet, or in the formulation of human and spiritual values that he can become truly creative, and where he is so sorely needed. Also in the field of exploring and developing man's spiritual possibilities in relationship to God—in leading men to know God through their own experiences with him does the Christian minister have a transcendent opportunity. I believe it was Dwight L. Moody who said that it remains to be seen what can be accomplished with a life that is completely dedicated to God. It may also be said that it remains to be seen what can be achieved by a society that is operated on a Christian basis by men and women who are truly and genuinely Christian. The task of the Christian leader is to condition the nature of men in its relationship to God and to society in such a way that all its tremendous possibilities through the power of God may be realized.

On the side of its teaching function the task of the theological seminary is to build through careful methods and techniques a psychology of the learning process in the field of religious experience. This is absolutely fundamental and necessary for a program of religious education. How do the basic religious concepts, as that of God for example, have their beginning, and how do they develop from immaturity to maturity?

In the field of secular education through the application of scientific

methods to the problems of learning we are rapidly accumulating a body of tested information that enables us to know rather accurately the psychology of reading, of the number concept, and of geography or the space concept. A child is not born into the world with a concept of number. We know that concept must be developed carefully from the first dawn of intelligence to full maturity. We know also that there are definite stages in the growth of the number concept from immaturity to maturity, and that certain teaching methods are applicable to one stage that are not at all applicable to other stages. In teaching a child the number concept, therefore, the soundest knowledge of the nature of the child and his learning processes is needed in order that his learning may be effective. In this connection we know that the "zero concept" is the most difficult of all the number concepts for children to acquire. Poor teaching at any stage in this learning process will greatly hamper a child's normal development. In order that this teaching may be done correctly we are spending millions of dollars each year in research and in the training of teachers to teach our children the fundamental concepts of number, of space, and of reading.

Now we know perfectly well also that children are born into the world without concepts of God, of love, or right and moral behavior. Each of these concepts must be developed carefully from immaturity to maturity. Do we know the psychology of their development from stage to stage and the necessary training and teaching techniques to be applied at each stage as we do for the number concept? I dare say that we do not. Yet the one is just as essential for Christian education as the other is for secular education. Perhaps, the most fundamental concept in religion is that of "God." It is basic to everything else, and yet it seems to me that the supreme tragedy of our religious experience today is that for the vast majority of people their concept of God has not been developed beyond the kindergarten stage. If anyone is inclined to disagree with this statement let him test it by investigating the concept of God held by a few representative adults. God is not a great reality for them that they have come to know by experience. He is all too often a mythical figure that belongs in nursery rhymes. And what do the majority of us know about prayer as a spiritual experience? How far have we developed this marvelous instrument of spiritual power? The disciples of Christ said, "Lord, teach us to pray." How much do we need to know how to pray?

These things a Christian minister must be able to do. If I want to learn mathematics I go to one who has had great mathematical experience, and out of the treasure of his experience he leads me step by step in my mathematical experience. If I want to learn music I follow the same procedure. If I am in search of religious or spiritual knowledge, to whom

shall I go? I can turn only to one who by his mastery in the field of spiritual phenomena can lead me to a knowledge of spiritual things. It is the function of a theological seminary to develop, and to supply this knowledge to our spiritual leaders.

A real theological seminary, therefore, can become and should be the most dynamic educational institution in our society. It has a vital function to perform as a professional school dealing with a definite area of human experience to explore that field for new discoveries of spiritual truths and new techniques for developing the religious life. Furthermore, it has a tremendous opportunity through its teaching function to develop a psychology of the learning process in religion and to send out well-trained leaders for our confused society, and finally we look to it to lead in the formulation of a program of action for organized Christianity.

# THE INDUCTION ADDRESS

MILTON G. EVANS, D. D., LL. D.
Former President, Crozer Theological Seminary

It is the function of an educational institution to conserve the tested values of the past. Tradition incorporates these values. It is like the trunk of a tree whose roots are deep in prehistory, and whose fruit matures in successive years. Tradition is not to be despised; it is to be interpreted and understood.

Hence a religious institution perpetuates moral sentiments older than Moses or Hammurabi, and embodied in later literature, known as the Decalogue, as prohibition to injure another in deed, word or wish; and finds a theistic reason for moral sentiments in experience of deliverance from some evil, as was done by an Israelitish interpreter: "I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The moral imperative arising out of the social experience of the race, and the religious interpretation arising out of spontaneous gratitude for good experienced are birthrights which we have inherited, and we barter them for hedonistic and utilitarian ends at the cost of becoming an Esau in the history of civilization.

But it is said that this is an age of science, of experimentation, and experimentation involves possibility of rejection of traditional standards. True, this is a scientific age preeminently. It is part of our inheritance. Experimentation in method is a legacy to be cherished. It has been handed down to us from ancestors long since dead. Nearly thirty centuries ago men asked, "Who will show us any good?" The answer then was, "Lift upon us the light of thy countenance, O Jehovah." We ask the same question, "Who shall show us any good?" Have we any other answer than the prayer, "Lift upon us the light of thy countenance, O Jehovah"? But a prayer is an experiment. It is of the nature of man to be ceaselessly engaged in moral and religious experimentation through prayer. There is no other method by which men may learn to know good, the good, the good above all goods, Life. In the process of experimentation it is well to be scientific enough to have on our lips constantly the petition of an old seeker after good, "Give me understanding that I may live." But understanding is other than information, other than knowledge, other than acquired technique, other than wisdom. It involves all of these and more. It is insight growing out of vision and experience. And vision

and experience are prerequisite in any hopeful experiment. But men of vision are rare in any civilization. They can be easily named, one by one. When centuries hence the Muse of History shall call the roll of our contemporaries who are proposing readjustments of standards in ethics and religion, will any one be hailed as a man of vision comparable to Moses, Amos, Isaiah, Paul, Socrates, Plato, Plutarch, Erasmus or Kant? It takes time to complete any experiment, much more in human relationship.

The other quality needed in experimentation is individual experience. Here arises the temptation to overvalue the experience of threescore years and ten, and to forget the accumulated experience of a thousand men living that length of time in succession. It is well to balance the experience of an individual with the experience of the race. If a contemporary theorist were a Methuselah just closing his nine-hundredth year, and not the child of fourscore years, his experience might have some authority for guidance. To be sure, the testimony of a single person living to a good old age has some weight—the weight of a polyp in a coral reef. This is not to disparage the individual, but to put him in his proper place. When we discover among contemporary and religious readjusters someone who combines the vision of a Moses with the age of a Methuselah, it will be well to heed his counsel. Meanwhile we who are experimenting to make our lives worth the living may continue to pray, " Give me understanding that I may live."

It is the function of the theological school to make understanding possible. Its students must learn to appreciate and to appropriate values of other cultures. Breadth, generosity and welcome are their watchwords. Here they acquire the power to crystallize truth into speech that stimulates and energizes and moralizes. This means that a theological institution tries to accomplish a threefold task in education:

First, academic scholarship in the most technical sense of the term is the aim of every department of instruction; second, refinement of culture that characterizes a gentleman in speech, in social deportment, and in generous appreciation of another's belief and conduct must be acquired; and third, a distinctively Christian attitude toward God and fellow men must be cultivated, so that professionalism and egotistic self-glorification may be avoided. For one of the most subtle temptations that comes to a Christian teacher is the conviction that he is called of God. Too frequently this conviction begets arrogance and bigotry and tyranny, rather than humility. The called apostle today must undergo a severer intellectual test than that demanded of the first preachers of the gospel. A theological school is no place for any degree of self-sufficiency. For today ecclesiastical guides have no special prerogatives, except such as their fellow men

may be willing to accord. Christian education itself has effected this. It is the Christian church that originated modern education in the Orient, where university faculties have not been accustomed to the traditional and artificial distinctions between Theology and Philosophy of Religion. In these universities scientific and philosophic studies are untrammeled by theological prepossession, with the result that their youth are emancipated from the superstitions of their traditional faiths. Superstitions arising in the Christian church, and sanctioned by generations of custom, must not be substituted for discarded superstitions.

In European countries theological schools had long been fettered by a confessional system, but within recent years most of the universities have freed the philosophical faculties from dogmatic constraints, while theological faculties remain hampered by confessional standardization. It is inevitable that students for the Christian ministry passing from the philosophical to the theological faculties should feel a change in attitude and in method. This is more true in the United States, where state universities are wholly free from church control, while the theological schools are controlled by denominations, or worse still, by a self-selected group within a denomination. Students accustomed to method and spirit sanctioned in schools dominated by confessional standards must feel awkward, to say the least, in learning to walk securely and gracefully in paths traveled in non-dogmatic institutions.

President Franklin, since you are now formally and publicly clothed with powers of an executive in a school founded and fostered by members of the Baptist denomination, it will be permitted me to be more specific. You are bringing to this institution the ideals that have been guiding you hitherto. You have changed the name of your office and your place of residence, but you have not changed your function in the Christian church. You are still its agent in interpreting the gospel you have been proclaiming since you first pledged loyalty to Jesus. You have only chosen a new fulcrum with which to move the world. In God's Providence, your fulcrum will be henceforth the Crozer campus. This, however, is only the point of rest upon which the lever turns. To carry out the analogy, the lever which you will pivot upon the fulcrum has been also providentially put into your hands.

At the risk of being charged with midrashic or homiletic fancy, I will describe what I conceive to be the leverage with which you will direct or modify or increase the power inherent in the gospel message. First, the charter of this school guarantees freedom from dogmatic control. Neither teacher nor pupil is required to make promises he cannot possibly redeem, if the school has any educational value. The charter assumes that confes-

sion of loyalty to Christ makes ample provision for adaptation of the Christian message to an ever-changing social environment. By this leverage, over two thousand years ago, the Græco-Roman world was lifted off its hinges; by this same leverage, the whole modern world, including civilizations unknown to Paul, is being lifted.

Second, the present Board of Trustees are a cross-section of our present-day cultured life. They represent the power of the Christian profession, not only in theology, but also in law, medicine, finance, industry, education, and polite literature. Each in his own calling illustrates the quality of life implicit in the Christian religion. They are living pledges of loyalty to the ideal of lifting our common humanity to their own level.

Third, the charter provides that the teachers be qualified to give thorough instruction in biblical, theological and other religious learning. Thoroughness in learning requires that the teaching staff have complete academic training, each in his own department; that they have pedagogical skill; that they have the industry and the ability to acquire and utilize the latest results of technical inquiry in any field of knowledge that may modify traditional interpretation of the Bible, creed, institution and polity; and that they keep in mind the duties of students as prospective preachers and pastors and missionaries. With this fourfold qualification of the corps of teachers, there can be no doubt of its lifting power.

Fourth, the alumni have their pivot of rest on this campus. Wherever a former Crozer student ministers in the spirit of the charter by whose authority he holds a degree or a diploma or a certificate, he has his own fulcrum like unto that of his Alma Mater. There are miniature Crozers in Japan, China, Philippine Islands, India, Burma, the Congo, South Africa, Australia, Europe, Great Britain, Canada, South America, Central America, and in almost every state of the Union. The power of the lever applied on this campus has been increased according to the laws of physics: the power multiplied by the distance from the fulcrum is equal to the product of the load and its distance from the fulcrum. The power here in a limited geographical area is felt wherever a Crozer graduate has served or is serving. Estimate, if possible, the lifting power of a theological school in ethics and in doctrine.

Last, but by no means least, the present and future students are part of the power exerted here now and projected into the indefinite future. They are here and will come here because of their Christian experience fostered in home and church. They have chosen to devote strength of body and mind to realize the ideals of Jesus. They have laid intellectual foundations for their professional work by collegiate preparation. Here they are ready for guidance and inspiration and have within themselves the stand-

ards by which to judge the quality of work done here in the lecture room. They need intellectual and moral equipment to meet without cynicism or despair the disillusionments that await them. For here and in subsequent years they will find new beliefs to be accepted, new objects of hope to be embraced, new loyalties to be loved. But faith, hope and love will endure if Jesus be accurately interpreted. These successive generations of students will extend Crozer's influence in time as well as in space. Immortality is guaranteed honest Christian teaching.

These five—charter, trustees, faculty, alumni, and students, are the lever pivoting upon the physical equipment here, with which the world is being moved and moved upward.

# TOWARD A FRESH AWARENESS OF GOD

## The Inauguration Address

JAMES H. FRANKLIN, D. D., LL. D.
President, Crozer Theological Seminary

In a day when practical atheism is so apparent in the world at large you have assembled here to unite in giving your blessing to an institution whose chief purpose it is to help men everywhere into a satisfying sense of the reality and presence of God. At a time when practical godlessness constitutes humanity's greatest peril you are here, representing various Christian bodies, numerous races, and many institutions of higher learning, because you join us at Crozer in an aspiration for a fresh awareness of God in the heart of humanity. You are here because you believe that the world's deepest need is for such a consciousness of the Eternal. You have come believing that our present day confusion is on us because we are too largely forgetting God. And you have come from many directions in order to bid Godspeed to an institution that would do its part in cooperation with others to help the children of men exclaim with fresh confidence: "God is not dead, nor doth he sleep."

Theoretically most men today are theists. Robert A. Milliken, perhaps America's best-known scientist, affirms, "Every one who reflects at all believes in one way or another in God." While he recognizes, as do we, that conceptions of deity must vary, he adds, "It is to me unthinkable that a real atheist should exist at all."

Very recently Dr. James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology in Bryn Mawr College, declared in an American magazine that while most of the great scientists of the day reject traditional ecclesiastical conceptions of deity, they are at one with most contemporary philosophers in placing a spiritual power at the root of the universe. Enough! We care little as to the name or phrase used in affirming belief in the Eternal. Call him the Eternal. Call him Infinite Reality. Call him the All Pervading Spirit. Call him spiritual power at the root of the universe if you prefer. In so doing you come close to the definition given by the man of Galilee nineteen hundred years ago when he said, "God is Spirit." "God is Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Yes, theoretically men almost universally are theists. Practically multitudes are atheists. Many are spending their days as if there were no God. They live without the warmth of a faith in *The Eternal Goodness.* They live without a sense of moral responsibility to a spiritual power at the root

of the universe. They are not attempting to bring their lives into harmony with that power. They recognize no moral responsibility to any power or spirit outside of themselves. They believe they can sow to the flesh without reaping corruption. Their philosophy is this: "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Theoretically they may be theists; practically they are atheists. Their faith is fixed on things that perish. They are in confusion because they do not recognize, as Mr. H. G. Wells says in one of his novels, that life begins nowhere and ends nowhere except in God. They make shipwreck because they drift with the currents of their own passions and ambitions, and look not up for a fixed star by which to steer their craft across the seas of life.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Materialism, secularism and sensuality have prevented multitudes from seeing him. Yet it must be recognized also that much of the scepticism of the hour is due to our inability to reconcile our traditional conceptions of deity with some of the demonstrated views of the universe as revealed by modern science. Many are finding it utterly impossible in the light of present-day knowledge to accept some of the traditional conceptions of God. But that does not necessarily prove them irreligious.

"As the forehead of man grows broader, so do his creeds." James Russell Lowell well said:

> God is not dumb that he should speak no more.
> Slowly the Bible of the race is writ.
> Each age, each kindred, adds a verse to it.
> Still at the prophet's feet the nations sit.

With faith that God is not dead, nor asleep, nor dumb, and that a fresh awareness of him is necessary to the life that now is and is to be, we on this campus would dedicate ourselves and our lives anew to the task of learning more about him for ourselves, and of sending out prophets in his name, at whose feet men will solemnly yet gladly sit. This responsibility we must accept, God being our helper.

Naturally you inquire as to the ideals of the one whom you today install in office. I gladly answer, not in terms of conventional theology or philosophy, but in the convictions which have been distilled in my own soul through the years, and tested by me to some extent in the laboratory of life.

For my colleagues as well as myself I dare to say that God being our helper, the Crozer tradition thorough scholarship of the freedom of the human soul shall be perpetuated. Believe us, spirit of Weston, heart of Evans! The torch you passed we take; be ours to hold it high. God being

our helper, we shall go on and on in our search for truth, remembering that the Father seeketh those to worship him who will worship both in spirit and *in truth.* We believe that the Eternal speaks today to sensitive souls as truly as in the past and in like manner. We shall continue to expect a progressive revelation to which the word " finis " shall never be written. We shall keep our eyes to the east expecting more light yet to break. We shall remember the Master's promise: " If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall liberate you." With that word we would link the utterance of another:

> He is free whom the truth makes free,
> And all are slaves besides.

But there must be no illusion as to the price to be paid by prophets. Often new light is painful to mortal eyes, and prophets frequently must suffer. In my own student days nothing impressed me more than the sight of a beloved teacher standing up to be executed officially for having taught a fact in history that was unacceptable to most Baptists of his day. He died of a broken heart, while now his position is all but universally recognized as in accord with the facts. Long ago he became, to at least one of his students, an illustration of Lowell's great words:

> By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
> Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back.

God helping us we shall continue to stand for the historic principle of our fathers, the sufficiency of the soul under God in matters of religion, assured that a larger apprehension of truth from every source will strengthen our awareness of God.

Once more in history it has become necessary to unfurl our banner with its inscription "A free church in a free state." We are unalterably opposed to those who make nationalism their religion, the state their God, and dictators their Messiahs. We shall continue to stand against all regimentation in the affairs of the soul, and to affirm that no man is wise enough to dictate another's religion. We accept neither for ourselves nor for others any program that tends toward ecclesiastical fascism. And the freedom which we demand for Baptists we demand with equal emphasis for others, whether they be evangelical Christians, Roman or Greek Catholics, Jews, Muhammadans, Buddhists, or even atheists. Man's soul must be free to seek for truth in its own way and to walk in such light as may be given him. If it be said that regimentation of all life is essential to economic betterment, in reply, " Man shall not live by bread alone." Bread man must have, and in sufficient quantity but not bread alone.

The battle for spiritual freedom may need to be fought again, in a day when both religious and political democracy is imperilled. If so, we would invoke the Eternal to marshal for our inspiration the spirits of John Hus, Balthazar Hübmaier, Zwingli, Luther, John Bunyan, John Wesley, yes and John Clifford, and a great cloud of other witnesses, including Edgar Y. Mullins, whose words are for the hour: "All souls have an equal right to direct access to God." "It is a species of spiritual tyranny for men to interpose the church itself, its ordinances, or ceremonies, or its formal creeds, between the human soul and Christ."

But it is not enough to stand for intellectual freedom alone. We who claim the promise, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall liberate you" need to remember that the free man in Christ should voluntarily become everybody's slave. We who make most of our own intellectual freedom should be the first to render sacrificial service in helping others to bear their burdens and in breaking the shackles of injustice that bind them. The world cares little for our declarations of intellectual freedom unless it discovers also that our principles prompt us to a greater readiness to give ourselves for others. I gladly identify myself with those who demand complete intellectual freedom, but I would warn my comrades that we are on trial. If our principles are really in harmony with the spirit of Christ, the very marks of the Lord Jesus should be on our lives, and the print of his cross should be on our shoulders. Vicarious suffering should have left its thorn marks on our brows, and its nail prints in our hands. We who boast of our freedom must humbly ask whether it deepens our readiness to live, and if need be die, for great causes.

So far as in us lies we intend to help men and women who study at Crozer to see that the Incarnation, with all of its marvel and mystery, grace and glory, did not come to an end in history nineteen hundred years ago, but is still perpetuated in humble souls who surrender themselves so fully to the eternal Christ that he relives his life in them. In recent years my duties have taken me into many parts of the earth, and in every land which I have visited I have found rare souls in whom Christ is fulfilling his promise: "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also." The students at this institution will be taught that their aspirations, and our own, should be as high as the apostle Paul's when he cried: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death." They will be taught that it is as possible for them as it was for the apostle Paul to say with all humility, "I am crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."

The students here will be taught that not only is God manifesting

himself as truly now as in the days of old, but that the spirit of the eternal Christ is still seeking expression in the lives of men as truly now as when Jesus of Nazareth walked the hills of Galilee. That, fathers, brothers, sisters, and friends, represents my central and deepest religious conviction; that is my faith. If I have formulated a creed of my own, it is this: God with us, Christ in us, the Kingdom of Heaven at hand. In such faith I would live and serve at Crozer, God being my helper.

We shall continue to teach in this school that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, and that here and now men who are spiritually renewed become members of it. In it they must live together as good members of the family of God, looking up to one Father of mankind and treating his children everywhere as their brothers and sisters, regardless of race, formal creed, or social distinctions. The Kingdom of God (or family of God on earth), we believe to mean the reign of justice, righteousness and fraternity among men. Lucian, the Greek satirist, writing perhaps one hundred and thirty years after the death of Christ referred to the founder of the Christian religion as a "man who was fixed to a stake in Palestine and who is still worshiped for having introduced a new code of morals in life." What was that new code of morals? Lucian adds that Jesus had persuaded his followers that they were brothers, and that they believed they would live forever. A new code of morals—brotherhood.

It is my belief that the chief passion of Jesus, stated in human terms, was for brotherhood, which he knew could be realized only as men were spiritually renewed or born into the family of God. That passion constantly brought him into conflict with selfish men who claimed special privileges for themselves, for their religion, their race or their nation. That passion strongly antagonized the selfish leaders in the temple. That passion for brotherhood and the establishment of the family of God on earth consumed him. He would have all men and women live together as good members of the Father's family on earth. That, in my opinion, was to be the Kingdom of Heaven among men. But such teachings were dynamite in the social and ecclesiastical circles of his day. They are dynamite as well in this day for any one who both preaches and practices them. The Sermon on the Mount laid the axe at the roots of many social, religious and political trees that cumbered the earth in the days of Jesus. It lays the axe at the roots of many trees in our day. No one who was such a disturber of the existing order could be tolerated. The principles of brotherhood were revolutionary then; they are revolutionary now. They took Jesus to the cross, and they still mean a *via dolorosa* for many who follow in his train. But even so, we shall teach brotherhood as the fundamental principle of the Kingdom of God on earth, and pray that if

need be, grace may be given us to take the cup and give thanks to cross the Brook Kidron into the Garden of Olives, and follow him even to Calvary.

Brotherhood is the world's greatest need, even in the realm of economics. Today there is food and raiment and shelter in plenty, and all that man requires for his physical comfort. But many who yearn for the opportunity to earn their daily bread are hungry and cold, and they hear the bitter cry of their children, while others have far more than they require, and ofttimes have not actually earned it. The world has enough of everything that man needs except a belief in a common father and a practice of brotherhood.

If the Sermon on the Mount were being practiced, and we were living together as good members of the family of God on earth, our racial hatreds would vanish. We should realize that black men, brown men, yellow men, and white men are equally loved by God and are entitled to equal opportunities. Then too, we should heed the command, "Put up thy sword, for they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Then should we prefer to lose our own lives rather than aggressively take our brother's blood. We may well be grateful for the growing determination to find other ways of settling our international disputes. But let no one imagine that pious platitudes or even wordy resolutions in condemnation of war are sufficient. We must ascertain the conditions, economic, racial and otherwise, in which wars are rooted and try to remove them. But the conditions in which wars are rooted cannot be changed without a spirit of brotherhood dominating the people. New men with such a spirit are needed to produce a new society. Carlyle was right: "The soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul." Herbert Spencer was right when he declared that there is no alchemy whereby we can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts. Mrs. Browning was right:

> Your fouriers failed,
> Because not poets enough to understand,
> That life is from within.

And all of these were but echoes of the words of the man of Nazareth: "Ye must be born again." Therefore, our chief mission at Crozer is to lead men to fall in love with Christ and his righteousness, and thus become new creatures. And as men live together as brothers in the family of God on earth they come into a closer fellowship with their Father.

At this institution we shall continue to promote an international, interracial and interdenominational Christian fellowship. This is no new thing at Crozer, but we hope for its larger development. Already men

and women are coming from the East and the West to sit down together here in the Kingdom of God. Their fellowship, in spite of racial and national differences, is inspiring. We welcome with equal warmth the representatives of various lands and races, not only for what they may learn in our classrooms, but for what they can contribute to the enrichment of life in America and the promotion of brotherhood the world around. At this crucial hour in world affairs, nothing is more urgently needed than international fellowship, and we trust that here on this campus a fellowship between men and women of many lands will so develop as to hasten the reign of understanding and peace throughout the earth. We confess to a vision of enlarged service along such lines.

Especially at this hour is it necessary to promote understanding and brotherhood between the races, even in our own land. Nothing is more devastating to society than racial hatreds. God being our helper, here at Crozer we shall endeavor to teach men to apply the spirit of Christ to race relations. Here already the representatives of various races are helping each other to a better understanding. Here we come to learn that God is no respecter of races. Here we come to question whether there is any inherently inferior race. Races there are that are backward, because of climatic conditions, economic suffering, or other causes. But are they inherently inferior? I think not. My journeys into many parts of the world have given me an aquaintance with brown men, black men, and yellow men with social, intellectual and spiritual gifts which I could covet for myself.

Here on the Crozer campus representatives of various races are learning to sing with enthusiasm:

> In Christ there is no East nor West
> In Him no North nor South,
> But one great fellowship of love
> Throughout the whole wide earth.

Soon we shall be singing with equal fervor:

> Join hands then, brothers of the faith,
> Whate'er your race may be.
> Who serves my father as a son
> Is surely kin to me.

While our Seminary was founded by Baptists, representatives of other denominations are on its Board of Trustees, and we welcome students from many other communions, all of whom are invited to our fellowship on equal terms. This is one of the glories of our school, where we attempt to comprehend with all saints the height and the depth, the length

and the breadth of the love of God. We believe that those things which separate groups of evangelical Christians are far less important than the point of agreement; namely, Jesus Christ. We believe that the hour calls for the fullest measure of cooperation between Christians of every name. I go further. I believe we should seek understanding, fellowship and cooperation with all religious groups whose motive is the uplift of humanity. We have nothing to fear, but much to be anticipated from such cooperation. Thus, in fellowship with all who love the Father in sincerity and truth and seek to do his will, shall we come to a fuller consciousness of him in human affairs. Unspeakably do I rejoice that the founders of this institution gave freedom to their successors to enjoy wide fellowship in service with others.

Of course we shall continue to stand for obedience to what is known as Christ's Great Commission. Crozer Alumni are to be found in every great section of the world, making disciples of the nations, while Oriental, European and African followers of Christ, as well as Americans, are welcomed in increasing numbers to our halls. As for the one whom you install in office this day, let it be said that from his youth up the Great Commission has been fundamental in his heart and life, whether he studied in college or served in the mining camps of the Rocky Mountains, in a city pastorate, or with home and foreign mission agencies. Here at Crozer it is not likely that such interest will be lessened. God being our helper, we shall try to do our part in arousing the church of Christ to a fresh enthusiasm in sharing the gospel with all men. We shall be disappointed if our sons and daughters do not go forth with a passion for sharing Christ with all men, both in America and in other lands. We shall be disconsolate if some of the best of them do not scorn places of ease and covet fields of hardship both at home and abroad.

But let no one suspect us of any teaching that the Great Commission can be fulfilled with efforts, however heroic, merely to proclaim the gospel orally and with inducing men to accept a baptism in water. Jesus was not always thinking of immersion in water when he spoke of baptism. "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" "I have an immersion to be immersed with." God forgive us if sometimes we have appeared to teach baptism in water as the principal objective of the Great Commission; if we have appeared to stress the outward sign rather than what is signified by the ordinance. Here at Crozer I shall teach that the Great Commission is fully obeyed only as we attempt to baptize all needy men, all nations, yes, the world itself, in the name, or nature, of God, which is love. I shall teach that the world's greatest problems must be baptized in love if they are to be solved.

We are interested in economic justice, and we must support all practical programs for its achievement, but let us realize that no system, be it ordered by Socialists, Fascists, Nazis, Bolshevists or Baptists, can succeed unless it be baptized in love. So must racial antagonisms be baptized in love. We stand for a warless world, and I at least would have America take its full part in those organizations designed to prevent hostilities, but we shall not have a warless world until the hearts of men are baptized more largely in love, which is the nature of God.

If we give ourselves to an effort to baptize every relationship of life in love and brotherhood, we shall find a fulfilment of the promise, " I am with you all the days." Thus shall we come to a fresh awareness of God, for " God is love," and " Where love is, there God is also."

Some one has said we are surest of God when we suffer and when we serve. Is it not so? Have not we been surest of God when we ministered to those in need or in sorrow? If then we have been surest of him when we gave the cup of cold water, shared our bread and our raiment, or sympathized with the sorrowing, how much more shall we enjoy a fresh awareness of God when we join others in baptizing the world's great problems in his name, which is love? Said George MacDonald:

> When I have lost myself in other men,
> And found myself in Thee—the Father then
> Will come with Thee, and will abide with me.

In youth especially we find a desire to apply the principles of Christ to the world's great problems, and a readiness to suffer in order to do so. When this is noted, it is easy to agree with Dr. Albert W. Palmer in believing that a new sense of the reality and contemporaneousness of God is just about to burst upon the world. God is inescapable. He will break through our paganism, and find prophets who out of their own convincing spiritual experiences will cry out: " God is not dead, nor doth he sleep." " Repent. Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Change your minds on the sins that destroy mankind and our civilization. Change your minds. Change your conduct. Live as good brothers and sisters, setting up the family of God on earth, and you will be sure of the Father's blessing." If the church can recover the lost radiance of the Christian religion, youth will be recaptured by the calls to service that require sacrificial suffering. Today the church is timid regarding some of the sins that threaten our civilization, and youth listens more to strange voices that demand more heroic action than is usually exacted by Christian forces. But let the church make it known that it goes forth to crusade for right, and justice, and brotherhood, and calls into service men and

women whose hearts have been renewed by the spirit of the Eternal and are ready to die for great causes. Then truly we shall have a revival of pure and undefiled religion. The older men may be sceptical regarding successful achievement in the Kingdom of God, but youth will triumph.

So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
  So near is God to man,
While duty whispers low "thou must,"
  The youth replies, "I can."

—*Emerson.*

Many years ago the Crozer seal was adopted. It is rich in its symbolism: a crosier (the shepherd's staff), the cross, and a scroll bearing the single word, "Emmanuel." We accept its symbolism for the future. God being our helper, we will exhort men to join the Good Shepherd in seeking souls lost in the wildernesses of life. We will also teach them to join the Good Shepherd in taking lambs into bosoms of compassion; in healing those whose bodies are torn by the thorns of adversity; in protecting them against the wolves of greed and hatred, and in bringing them at last in safety to the Father who has many sheep of many folds. But we would not forget that a shepherd must also bring back those who stray into forbidden fields.

A just complaint against our modern preaching is that there is too little said regarding the consequences of sin, and man's need for repentance at a time when the world suffers so gravely from the transgression of moral and spiritual laws. We trust that from these halls prophets will go out to rebuke men for their sins and to call the world to repentance. We trust that from these halls prophets will continue to go out with a passion for preaching the gospel of Christ and for leading men to accept him as the Saviour and Lord of their lives. Let there be no apology for such a ministry. It may not take the old forms, but evangelism there must be. The church is doomed when it loses its desire to bring men into fellowship with Christ. The church fails in its usefulness when it neglects to call men to the life in Christ that is eternal. It fails, too, when its services of worship do not result in the quiet, perhaps unconscious, determination of the worshipers to choose the higher paths in daily life. May Crozer men bear the shepherd's staff worthily.

On our seal we find the cross also—the Cross of Calvary. God being our helper we would accept it, not merely as a symbol, but as the dynamic of our lives for sacrificial suffering. Let no one be content to place the cross on the spires, or even on the altars, of the churches. Let it be in the hearts of the worshipers in the temple and as they walk the

streets of life. Not merely on golden chains over soft raiment, but deep in the soul of man. I hold to no theory of the cross. I know an event on Calvary that throws light on the paths of men and leads them Godward. I know that as I contemplate the Cross and Him who was nailed there, I am surest of God and am moved to give myself even as he gave himself. In ways that defy human language I know it has its place in salvation, redemption, atonement. But it cannot be summed up in a theory or doctrine. Truly has it been said, "You might as well try to catch Niagara in a teacup as to hold the meaning of the atonement in a theory."

I know not how that Calvary's Cross
A world from sin could free;
I only know that matchless love
Has brought God's love to me.

This I do know: the Cross of Calvary must become a part of the disciple's own spiritual experience if he is to have his part in vicarious suffering which is essential to fellowship with Christ in the redemption of mankind. But do not misunderstand me. We are not dealing with conventional terms, nor theological formulæ. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves."

Cursed through the cure of Calvary's cross
Are they, not cured through Calvary's curse
Who think the remedy a simple wash
And would apply, but not assimilate
The blood thereof which is the life thereof.

Unless the death of Christ imparteth life,
What better than an idol is the cross?
The faith that saves is not the faith that says
That "Jesus died for me" and finds the blood
A sleeping potion, not inspiring wine.
The faith that saves receiveth life from God
And manifests itself in loving deeds.

God being our helper, we shall endeavor to keep Christ and his cross at the center of this institution, and to send forth men who will attempt to take the cross into every relationship of life, with faith in an eternal Christ alive for evermore.

The third symbol on our seal is the scroll with the single word "Emmanuel"—God with us. In history it has had a double meaning. With the prophets it was often a solemn word—a word of frightful warning. "Our God is with us a consuming fire for evil-doers who will not repent. Utterly will he burn up in eternal heat the chaff and the briars. He is here for judgment. Tremble and flee from judgment to

come, ye who oppress the weak and rob the poor. Our God is with us and he is a consuming fire.

But Emmanuel is also the sweetest of words for the burdened and penitent: Emmanuel—our God is with us and he is like Jesus in spirit. He that hath seen the Eternal Christ knows what God is like. He is the image of the Invisible One. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God shines in his face. He knew how to threaten the judgment of the Eternal on unrepentant evil-doers. To hypocrites he cried: "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?" But to the penitent he spoke with infinite compassion. He makes us think of the tenderness of Isaiah: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near, let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." But He speaks for himself, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

Crozer evangelists, go with a message of the living God. Seek him until from your hearts you can cry, "He is not dead nor doth he sleep." Seek to know his purposes until you can cry, "Repent, repent. The kingdom of God is coming." And so it is coming. God has never lacked for prophets in days of crisis. As we suffer and serve we shall come into a fresh awareness of him the world around. In this day of crisis:

Oh, let the soul within you
For the truth's sake go abroad.
Strike! Let every nerve and sinew
Tell on ages, tell for God.

Today we dedicate ourselves afresh to an attempt so to follow the Christ that we shall enter into a new assurance of the presence of God and help others to seek to know him and to do his will.

The Crozer Hymn is "Jesus, Still Lead On." To that hymn we would add the poetic prayer of Herman Hagedorn:

God, who gavest men eyes
To see a dream;
God, who gavest men heart
To follow the Gleam;
God, who gavest men stars
To find heaven by;
God, who madest men glad
At need to die;
Lord, from the hills again
We hear thy drum!
God, who lovest free men,
God, who lovest free men,
God, who lovest free men,
Lead on! We come.

# RELIGION IN THE JAPANESE MIND

CHARLES HATCH SEARS

UNLIKE the Western nations generally, since the dawn of modern times, Japan has been essentially homogeneous in race. In visiting the Hokkaido —the extreme northern province—the writer was keenly interested in the curious wood work of the *Ainus,* survivors of the aborigines of the archipelago, who to this day remain a distinct people. In central and western Japan his attention was called to neglected, despised groups, the *Eta* people, engaged in tasks which the Japanese, particularly the Buddhists, refuse to perform—the handling of hides and of leather, the slaughter of animals and the sale of meat, particularly pork. Neither the Ainus, nor the Eta people are factors in Japanese life of today, indeed never have been. They are ignored by the Japanese and largely neglected by the missionaries. A lone exception is the work of the Church Mission Society of England which sent missionaries to Japan especially to serve the Ainus, then dispersed over practically the whole of the Hokkaido but since driven further northward.

Before the dawn of modern history sturdy immigrant invaders of obscure origin drove back the hairy, dark-eyed Ainus and, like the Israelites of old, occupied the land. They and immigrants from China and Korea and from the mainland farther north achieved a national unity long centuries before Japan was known to the Western world—a unity so complete that hardly any sense of race division or antagonism remains. The Japanese are essentially one people, in sharp contrast with the Western nations, even long-established nations like France and England, as a mere cursory glance of maps of racial origins reveals.

Review early American colonial history with Turner as an illustration. One finds separate colonies each bent upon the preservation of its own race and its peculiar pattern of European culture without the remotest idea of achieving a new nation from diverse racial strains, as finally eventuated. Moreover, these qualities or characteristics now regarded as American appear to have been an outgrowth of frontier life rather than of race—the spiritual qualities which transcend race and which made *The Epic of America* as portrayed by James Trusloe Adams. Adams has described the America of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: The American mind which developed on the frontier was regnant in America until perhaps the last decade of the nineteenth century when, coincident with the resting of the frontier on the Pacific coast, the arrival of new racial groups, indus-

trialism and new trends in city life began to make vital changes in the American mind. Now again the American mind is in the making and has not yet come to maturity, quite contrary to the implication of Andre Siegfried in his *America Comes of Age.* Today there is scant evidence that America has attained maturity, on the contrary there is every evidence of surging adolescence. Since the advent of the new immigration in 1890, has not America in large sections been remade racially by the infusion of new racial stock? Has not America been remade spiritually within the same period by the insurgent ideas of these new peoples, by industrialism, by urban conditions, and since the end of the great war by the release of world currents of thought?

Japan has been spared any such racial infusion, though spiritual upheavals are not new to her. While Japan's blood stream is homogeneous, her mind currents are heterogeneous. For centuries Japan has had the tremendous advantage of racial unity, but for more than a thousand years she has had to appropriate new cultures. Now as in the eighth century after the advent of Chinese culture and of Buddhism, the effect is revolutionary.

### The Effect of Religion on the Japanese Mind

It is a curious fact that new cultures have been introduced into Japan mainly through alien religions—an interesting commentary on the dictum of parlor religious philosophers of America that the ancestral faith of every nation and every individual should be left quite undisturbed. So far as the narrow limit of this paper permits, let us inquire what changes have been made in the Japanese mind through the missionaries of three alien faiths, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Christianity.

The Western student is impressed both by the persistence of the old and by the penetration of the new in every phase of Japanese life—as true of his religious as of his social life generally. Illustrations of this were repeatedly brought to the attention of the writer when engaged as a "Fact Finder" in the study of the Japanese Christian Movement—bullock carts and automobiles; electric lights over tatami in the home; ancient headdress and modern sport clothes of women; classical Japanese and American slang—Shinto shrines and Christian churches.

"What is that noise that awakens me every morning?" I asked my host, Doctor Bouldin, at the time President of the Baptist Theological School at Fukuoka. "Oh, that is the sun worshiper who lives on the next property," he replied. "Every morning, winter or summer, rain or shine, he is out at sunrise to worship the sun. A representative of Japan's newest religious faith had introduced me to a representative of her primitive religion."

### The Influence of Shinto on the Japanese Mind

Shinto, the religion of Japan at the dawn of history, has developed from an unorganized worship of deities and spirits both of nature and of the dead. We may not here describe or characterize this religious system except to call attention to its remarkable evolution. We are concerned here only with its effect on the creation of the Japanese mind. In the early centuries no unified national influence appears to have been exerted by this primitive faith; quite the contrary, it tended to particularize life, not to generalize or unify it. Like the Latin Penates, its influence centered in the home and in the field where the farmer was brought in touch with nature and made conscious of nature's God. Natural objects, animal spirits and the spirits of the deceased were deified or rather recognized as an abiding pervading influence, for, in the popular Japanese thought, there is no vital difference in essence between the spirit of man, the spirit of an animal, and the spirit of " the higher " or the divine.

Through the centuries, however, central place was given to the Sun-goddess. This has special significance for our purpose, for it was a step toward the creation of the national dogma which persists to this day in the popular mind, that the Imperial family is directly descended from the Sun-goddess and rules by virtue of this divine origin, and has the incomparable advantage of divine inspiration. Anesaki, a Buddhist whose scholarship is recognized by all faiths, says in his *History of Japanese Religion:*

> When the tribes and clans were gradually amalgamated under the power and prestige of a ruling family who were believed to have descended from the Sun-goddess, this goddess was revered as the supreme deity of Shinto, and her worship became the central feature of the national cult.

In this way Shinto has helped to create a national mind for the Japanese. Religion has been the chief factor in the creation of patriotism which centers in the person of the Emperor even more than does the patriotism of the English center in the person of the King as the symbol of British unity. The Japanese Emperor as the immediate representative of the Sun-goddess is more than a symbol of national unity, he is the ultimate authority, hence the immediate relation of religious faith to authority in Japan. Hence also the place of *State Shinto* with its ritualistic demands upon all officials and upon all public school children regardless of parental faith though rationalized as an act of patriotism rather than an act of worship and so accepted generally by Japanese Christians, even by outstanding intellectuals. But there is evidence that even Christians

sometimes find their loyalties confused. An outstanding Christian leader regarded by the "Fact Finders" as perhaps the most efficient churchman in Japan, in an intimate personal conversation with the writer, said in substance:

> There are doubtless peculiarities in the Japanese mind, but we should remember that there have been many outside influences, for example, Confucianism, Buddhism, Western culture, science, Communism, Marxism and the like. . . My mother was a Buddhist. My father, a Samurai, was a Shinto with Confucian training. I found myself drawn between the two. I became a Christian at the age of twenty. Since then I have been trying to Christianize both strains in my spiritual make up. Sometimes I have felt myself more of the earlier than of the latter—more of a Shintoist and a Buddhist than a Christian, though I have ever tried to be a devoted Christian.

This national unity, as we shall see, has been strengthened by the Buddhist emphasis upon a central deity and, as we were advised by representatives of other faiths, by the Christian emphasis upon monotheism. It is clearly recognized by Japanese thinkers, Shinto and Buddhist as well as Christian, that the unifying conception of monotheism is essential to the unification of thinking as it applies to every phase of Japanese life.

### Influence of Buddhism Upon the Japanese Mind

While the only invasion which ever threatened Japan was averted by the wreck at sea of the Chinese fleet in the thirteenth century, the event has had great significance in Japanese history. The writer was taken to see the embankment thrown up near the coast at Fukuoka in southwestern Japan as a defense against the threatened Chinese invasion. It bears mute testimony to the fear of this invasion which has carried down through six hundred years. The rejoicing in this deliverance is symbolized today by a memorial park in the same city. (Interesting illustrations, these, of the effect of memorials in keeping alive ancient fears and in stimulating current hates.)

The penetration of Buddhist influence from China and Korea at the sixth and seventh centuries is somewhat comparable to the introduction of Greek culture into Europe. It appears to have marked a real renaissance in the culture of Japan. Doctor Anesaki says:

> The gradual introduction of Chinese civilization, dating from about the third century of the Christian era, and that of Buddhism in the sixth century, were concomitant with a vigorous social growth and the progress of national unity. The nation was beginning to learn new things from the then flourishing culture of the Asiatic continent, and Buddhism gave a vital impetus to the development of civilization by inspiring higher ideals and encouraging the arts and literature. The new

religion imported arts and science, letters and philosophy, all working as instruments of its propagation, and through the astounding progress of its missionary work the whole country was almost transformed into a Buddhist land in the course of the seventh century. . . A deep inspiration derived from Buddhism marked the sentiment and life of the people, so that we could date from the tenth century, the ripening of national literature profoundly tinged with Buddhist sentiment.

But more basic even than this appears to have been the psychological and philosophical influence of Buddhism in its conception of the fundamental "oneness of all being." The conception of universals in the place of the old particularism of the Shinto faith is deemed basic to Japanese thinking and worked toward Japanese unity. Anesaki says of Buddhist influence:

This universalism was indeed an ideal never dreamt of before by the Japanese, and this religion of all-embracing love and salvation gave the people a wider and deeper comprehension of human life, an aspiration for an incomparably broader communion than had been taught by Shinto or Confucianism.

### Influence of Confucianism Upon the Japanese Mind

Another alien religion introduced into Japan from China has profoundly influenced the Japanese mind. Confucian influence affected human relations in the family—of son to father, of children to family, particularly the older brother's relation to the family economically dependent upon him; and in time extended to the political realm where it built up an ethical code in the relation of the daimyos to their retainers, the *Samurai.* (Daimyos, or feudal lords under the Shogun, who in authority virtually had superceded the Emperor, ruled Japan from the beginning of the seventeenth century down to modern times (1867). The Samurai represented the "military class" and the "gentry of Japan" and certainly were the backbone of the social system in Japan during this period.) This code of ethics centering in loyalty was inspired by teachers upon whom Confucianism relied for its propagation. With the restoration of the Empire, this loyalty was invoked and brought to their support when the *Shogun* yielded his political power to the Emperor in 1867 and Japanese life was again unified. Anesaki bears this testimony to the influence of Confucianism in the development of Japanese national life or in our terms, in the creation of the Japanese mind:

Confucianism, the ethical system of the northern Chinese, came into Japan and gave impetus to the further development of her national life. Its teaching furnished materials for social institutions, political organization, the systematization of moral precepts. Early Shinto had no clear conception of loyalty or filial piety, the virtues which played so important a part in the moral life of the people.

According to one of the early Confucian teachers (Murio Kyuso, 1658-1734):

> The cardinal virtues are filial piety, loyalty, and obedience, because every individual is bound by gratitude toward his father (the mother is not mentioned), the lord, and the sage or teacher (meaning chiefly Confucius). The sense of indebtedness is the source of benevolence, while justice means the practice of good-will in human relationships according to social grades. Protection and obedience, benefaction and gratitude, benevolence and fidelity, each of these combinations represents the fundamental nature of our life, the foundation of human life based on the heavenly reason.

And thus it came about that another alien religious system with its strong ethical emphasis contributed to the development of the Japanese mind. As an interesting illustration of the relation of the new to the old and indeed of the old to the new, is this testimony of an old Christian pastor in Kyoto, one of the Christian survivors of the old Samurai class in Japan:

> The Japanese mind is epitomized in Bushido,[1] which exalts loyalty and self-sacrifice. The same loyalty which was once paid to the feudal lords and then to the Emperor may now be directed to God, all in the process of enlarging the circle of loyalty. Bushido makes it easier for the Japanese people to understand the meaning of the Cross. *Otokodate,* a kind of chivalry quick to defend the weak and oppressed, sprang up among the common people in feudal days, and, like *Bushido,* emphasized self-sacrifice for others.

## The Influence of Christianity Upon the Japanese Mind

What part was Christianity destined to take in the creation of the Japanese national mind? The first introduction of Christianity into Japan by the Roman Catholics in the sixteenth century (1549), proved unfortunate. It was at a period of national confusion without any effective central authority. After a brief period of remarkable growth, due in part to political patronage—a growth said to have reached 750,000 adherents—in 1597, twenty-six Franciscans, Jesuits and lay Catholics suffered martyrdom. Ruthless persecution followed. By 1624 the entire Christian body had been exterminated, forced to recant, or had been driven into hiding. It is estimated that up to 250,000 people suffered martyrdom. The survival in faith for nearly 250 years without priests, churches or sacraments of a very considerable body of Christians is an evidence of enduring elements of faith as of the spirit of loyalty deeply inwrought in the Japanese character. Surviving Christians came out of hiding after Japan was opened to Western influence.

[1] See *Bushido, the Soul of Japan,* by Doctor Nitobe, in which he sets forth the code of the Samurai, largely drawn from Confucianism.

The only discernible positive effect of Christianity on the Japanese mind of this early Christian period is the recognition by leaders of other faiths, as witnessed by them to the Fact Finders, that these Christian martyrs have helped to cultivate devotion and loyalty.

The negative effect of this first impact of Christianity upon the Japanese mind was startling.

> This was practically an end of the "Kirishitan" religion and the consequence was the entire isolation of Japan from the world; only a few Dutch merchants and a number of Chinese being allowed to come to Japan, while any Japanese attempting to go abroad was put to death. . . Thus was established a reign of national seclusion lasting over two centuries, certainly due to the evils of "Kirishitan" but more to the caprice or cowardice of a tyrant.

The Shogun of the time, Yeyasu, a kind of Japanese Hitler, was bent on national unity within his personal control. These words of Anesaki in the light of recent history, have a decidedly modern ring:

> Apparently a policy of toleration was his attitude toward religion, but any sect asserting itself beyond the assigned limit would never be tolerated. He made a kind of established church of Buddhism, but an intractable section of Nichirenites was severely suppressed; similarly the Kirishitan Church was intolerable to him, because of its allegiance to or connection with a foreign power, no matter whether Rome or Manila or Macao.

This early Christian movement fell a victim to the political philosophy of the time, accentuated by the indiscretion of priests and because of the relation of the church to Rome and to certain foreign governments. Again we quote from Anesaki, a recognized authority on this period.

> Not only the meddling of some Franciscan missionaries in politics but the suspicion directed toward all the missionaries made the situation worse, which was aggravated by the coming of the Dutch and English, who endeavored to supply evil informations about Spain and Portugal. These circumstances gradually convinced the new ruler of the evils of the new religion, chiefly from political considerations.

It is interesting that Christianity was rejected by the Japanese, at the time under the leadership of an extreme nationalist, because it appeared to militate against national unity providing an interesting negative evidence that religious systems survive as they contribute to national ends, with all the dangers that are implied in this statement.

The writer was taken to a Buddhist memorial building in Fukuoka erected to symbolize the triumph of Buddhism over Christianity. It bears unconscious tribute to Christianity in the use to which it is put—a Buddhist adaptation of the Young Men's Christian Association program.

The real period of Christian penetration of Japan dates from the

arrival of the first Protestant missionaries in 1859, five years after the landing of the " Black Ships " of Commodore Perry in Yokohama Harbor. With the dawn of the Meiji era in 1868 and the establishment of normal relations between Japan and the Western world, the Christians found themselves in a position of peculiar influence though limited in its scope. Anesaki says:

> The first success of Christian missions was a credit to the zeal of the missionaries, but no less a part in it was played by the earnest zeal of the neophytes. These enthusiasts were mostly young men of the Samurai class, and their idea in embracing the new faith consisted largely in an earnest aspiration to work out the spiritual resurrection of the nation in conjunction with the new political life.

Anesaki continues:

> While the missionaries were starting their work in Japan, an earnest Japanese was preparing himself in America for the Christian cause. He was Joseph Neesima, who had managed to get into an American ship in 1864, at the risk of life, and studied at Andover through the fatherly support of Alphus Hardy, of Boston. Neesima's idea in attempting the adventurous passage had been to learn the secret of Western civilization, which he had supposed to lie in physical and military sciences but finally discovered in the Christian religion.

Confirming this opinion of this Buddhist scholar, an outstanding Christian pastor of Osaka in speaking to the writer of the Christian leaders of the early period of the modern Christian movement, said:

> Under the leadership of such men as Doctors Ebina, Kozaki, and others, the church captured the leadership of the nation, through its contribution to the value of the individual, its emphasis on education and the Christian interpretation of scientific thought. This met with the hearty support of the Government which was trying at the time to strengthen the schools, and was looking for some such interpretation.

The opportunity to meet and to converse with the widow of Joseph Neesima, at a reception to the Fact Finders in the Kyoto Hotel, brought forcibly to the writer's mind the brevity of the modern Christian movement in Japan. A visit to Doshisha University, a truly indigenous institution planted by a Japanese and today deriving ninety per cent. of its support from the tuition of students, witnesses to the permanency of Christian influence and its wide outreach. Anesaki bears witness to the peculiar opportunity of Christianity to influence the Japanese mind along educational lines:

> Neesima had to face another problem, the prejudice of the nation in favor of merely technical instructions and its neglect of moral education. He had to awaken his countrymen to the evils of a one-sided technical education and to the need of moral inspiration. . .

The place of Christianity in directing the national Japanese mind to the value and significance of the individual referred to above has had very far-reaching results. For example, the family has ever been at the center of Japanese social life. Anything that affects the family affects Japan. There is, therefore, real significance in Anesaki's affirmation:

> Another important point is the confirmation of monogamy, an indirect influence of Christianity, which has almost transformed the family life, particularly of the upper classes.

This testimony is confirmed by Doctor Kagawa, who, in speaking of the penetration of Christian thought in Japan, said to the writer:

> Christianity has laid the foundations of personal purity and monogamy; has cultivated the spirit of service, the spirit of love and universal peace; and has given basis to the labor movement.

Speaking of the influence of Christianity upon social work, an influence which has helped to shape the modern Japanese mind, Anesaki says:

> In social work modern Japanese Buddhism has derived much stimulus from Christianity, which it has taken as a model, but it must not be forgotten that the deeper motive comes from the original soul of the religion and the models of past ages. Yet it is questionable whether Buddhist activity is sufficient to cope with the grave situation of the present.

Space does not permit further reference to the influence of the Christian movement on Japanese thought except to point out that after diligent inquiry in long interviews with some one hundred and fifty Japanese leaders, Christian and non-Christian, in various parts of Japan, the writer was unable to discover any attempt or desire on the part of Japanese Christians to "Japanize" Christianity or to use it in the interest of extreme nationalism as is being done today in Germany.

"Christianity, to my mind, should be international and universal rather than national," is the strong conviction of Rev. H. Hatanaka, of Osaka. "Christianity, to my mind, is international and universal rather than national," is the observation of Baron Sato, said to be the most outstanding layman in northern Japan, but he adds: "Christianity has a national character as well as an international character. It can be naturalized." "Christianity is being influenced inevitably by environmental factors. Differentiation will come about naturally," in the opinion of Rev. K. Takahashi, of Sendai; "no effort to nationalize Christianity is necessary."

### Modern Confusion

One cannot speak with any degree of assurance of the effect of religion of whatever faith upon the solution of present-day problems in Japan.

Of the gravity of the present situation and of the failure of Christianity as of other faiths to meet present-day needs Anesaki says:

> Many people call modern civilization Christian, but it is evident to every unbiased observer that Christianity is not taking the lead in civilization but is struggling to accommodate itself to it.

Again we find confirmation of this position of Anesaki by Rev. H. Hatanaka, of Osaka. After making the statement to the writer referred to in a preceding paragraph, he said:

> But at the present time the issue in Japan is not science versus religion, not the place of the individual in society, but the solution of economic problems, especially as presented by Marxism, Socialism and by Russian Communism; that this situation has created great nervousness on the part of the government. . . As a matter of fact, the Christian church has not a clearly defined message or technique, and finds itself in a very embarrassing position so far as these vital problems with which the young people are chiefly concerned. . . We are fighting with our backs to the wall, not knowing which way to turn.

"What solution have the churches of America to give us?" was Mr. Hatanaka's final challenge. The writer was compelled to say that the churches of America were faced with a similar dilemma and had not been able to give any adequate answer. Has it not been clearly shown that the Japanese mind has been shaped through the centuries by the four religious systems which have dominated the life of the Japanese people? Is there not significance for the missionary movement of today in the striking fact that but one of these religions is an indigenous faith and that the others were introduced into Japan by missionaries? Finally, encouraged by the social outlook which has been brought to Japan through the Christian emphasis upon the value and place of the individual and by its revealed power to redeem individuals and to transform social conditions, may we not believe that Christian prophets will arise with a message adequate for the present world crisis and that Christianity shall not fail those who look to it for guidance in such an hour as this?

# AN EPISODE IN THE MESSIANIC HOPE[1]

I. G. MATTHEWS

THERE was a time when the Messianic Hope was the center of Christian thought. The student considered it the chief glory of the Covenant and the final apologetic for the supernatural origin of Christianity. Commentator and preacher alike scanned the prophets, the law and the apocalypses, in eager search for predictions, symbols and analogies, that might enrich their cherished dogma. "The seed of the woman," "the scarlet thread," "the man riding on an ass's colt," the hues and fabric of the tabernacle covers, all and many more have been used as final proof of the nature and the work of the Messiah. Letters and numbers, the beasts of Daniel, the image of gold, silver, iron and clay, have all been minutely scrutinized to find the pattern and the date of the incoming kingdom. Men, scholarly and reverent, have spent their lives in such tasks, and have believed sincerely that "it is better to look for Christ ten times where he is not to be found than to omit to seek him once where he is to be found."

But times have changed. The value of such methods of interpretation is seriously questioned, if not entirely discredited, and interest in the Messianic Hope is at low ebb. Reality in religion and an adequate basis for our faith, are the demands of today. Vague platitudes are accepted only by the unthinking, and slogans old and new are under suspicion. Some people may be comforted by that blessed word "Mesopotamia," but in the church and out of it, the question grows "What does it mean?" Tracking a stray word through sixty different books, the product of more than ten centuries of religious experience, patching together half verses of Genesis with fragments of Daniel or Revelation, fitting letters, numbers and symbols into a theological pattern, may be to some minds as intriguing as the prevalent cross-word puzzle, but this is inadequate as a foundation on which to build either Christian character or Christian theology. Common sense and scholarship agree that the Scriptures should not be treated in this haphazard way. The Bible is no magical text to be subjected to the vagaries of fancy, but is a book of vital experiences, to be studied sanely and reverently if we are to understand the thought of the God of history.

This, the historical study of Scripture, is arduous but profitable. It reduces the subjective element to a minimum, and raises the accuracy of the results to a maximum. Traditional interpretations are sometimes out-

[1] The Matriculation Address, delivered at the Crozer Theological Seminary, September 25, 1934.

lawed by our growing knowledge and by our more comprehensive studies, but the newer conclusions are more surely founded and in no way lack in vital religious values.

The Messianic Hope is one of the Old Testament doctrines that has been in the melting-pot and has been transformed. The old Messianism, with its imaginative and dogmatic use of Scripture, its wealth of material for religious oratory, and its rich emotional appeal has failed to pass the tests and is bankrupt in the field of practical religion. Hence, traditional Messianism is a lost hope, in which, save in sporadic cases, the church has little or no interest.

Granted this lack of interest, the question remains, is there an adequate basis for a Messianic Hope today, or is it a vestigial remnant of Hebrew religion, valuable, indeed for the time in which the writers lived, but now only an evidence of an outworn stage in primitive thinking? The study of the movement as a whole is here impossible, but a single episode, and that one of the darkest, may throw light on our problem.

The illustration selected for our consideration, belongs to the period 522-516 B. C., during the building of the second temple in Jerusalem, when, in the hopes and the plans of the leaders, Zerubbabel, the civil ruler, was the central figure. The immediate background is clear. In 597 B. C. and again in 586 B. C. Jerusalem had suffered siege and capture. On both occasions many prominent citizens had been exiled to the farther East. The land of Judah was desolate, the smaller cities were destroyed and Jerusalem lay in ruins. The following half-century, to 539 B. C., favored by comparative peace, was a period of reconstruction. Exiles in Babylonia were dreaming of home, and far away from the ruins of the temple they were reconstructing their Jewish worship, while the peasants at home, as their conditions improved, began slowly to formulate their state policies. The world crisis of 539 B. C., when Cyrus, the invincible leader of the troops of Anshan, shook the kingdoms of the world to their foundations and ruled over an Empire greater than ever before known, gave an impetus to all such dreams and schemes. Jewish writers saw in this amazing spectacle, in which great Babylon fell, the direct answer to their prayers. Their day of Jubilee, their liberation had come. Then for two decades nothing of importance happened. It was not until 522 B. C., when Darius, a royal Prince of Persia, after Gaumata the usurper had been slain, ascended the throne, that dreaming was translated into action. Leaders in nine of the recently conquered nations, believing the Persian power to be unstable, marshaled their veterans against the newly crowned king. All hither Asia was an armed camp, and Darius without an ally had a world war on his hands. It was a well-nigh hopeless task and it

was a safe wager that Persia could not hold her far-flung frontier lines. In the war clouds that hung so low over Persia the Old Testament prophets heard the voice of Jehovah their God announcing the resurrection of his Kingdom.

To the hopes born of this international cataclysm was added the stimulus of a great tradition. Small as Judah was, she had had a glorious history. In the dim past she had been on an equal footing with Tyre and Damascus and had trafficked with Assyria and Egypt. She had had as kings David and Solomon, to her, greater and wiser than the Pharaohs of the South or the Sultans of the East. Material decadence for four hundred years had not dimmed these memories, indeed tradition had enhanced their glory. In fact, her religious interpretation of history had added its quota to Jewish aspirations and egoism. Jehovah was her God, unlimited in power. He could save by few or by many. With him the impossible had been, and again could be, achieved.

Allied to this was the conviction that his power lay deeper than the physical and the military. He was the God of right rather than the God of armies or of nations. That the little finger of Persia could crush the life out of Judah was apparent to all, but the Faith of Judah was not in the impedimenta of life so much as in the imponderables. Hence because of this idealization of their history and their faith in the God of history, in this hour of world calamity, her leaders, Haggai, Zechariah and Zerubbabel believed they saw, as it were, emblazoned in the sky the divine assurance that this was the hour of their triumph. This was made doubly sure to them by a word of Jeremiah, who in 593 B. C. had declared that there would be no immediate return from captivity, as the Babylonian rule would continue for three generations or for seventy years (Jer. 27:7; 29:10). Zechariah, who pondered over this seventy years during which Jehovah had indignation against Jerusalem (Zech. 1:12), found its conjunction with the world wars of 521 B. C. to be a mathematical demonstration. Nothing then was lacking save the response of the people. When they built the temple and crowned the prince, Jehovah would be with them. The Messianic Hope rose now to its highest pitch in all history, for the promise was "not by might and not by power but by my spirit." Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David, was the branch of Messianic promise (Zech. 3:8; 6:12). He was the signet ring on the finger of the Most High (Hag. 2:23). He had laid the foundation of the temple, his hands also would finish it (Zech. 4:9). Here it has been said we meet "the first undoubted example of the identification of an historical character with the Messiah.[2]

[2] Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life After the Exile*, p. 11.

The people inspired by this urgent hope put forth heroic efforts, and in the face of the greatest difficulties completed the building of the temple (Hag. 2:9, 18; Zech. 4:7-9; Ezra 3:8, 10; 5:1, 2). A crown, from gold sent home by the exiles, was made for Zerubbabel (Zech. 6:10-14). A service for the dedication of the temple and for the coronation of the king was planned and perhaps was carried out (Hag. 2:23; Zech. 3:8; 4:7-9). All the conditions were fulfilled. All were confident that the God who had promised would manifest his power and that their kingdom, the Messianic kingdom, would be established in dazzling splendor. The closing words of Zechariah, "Jehovah is with you" (Zech. 8:23) is one of the great outbursts of confidence in religious history.

### Shattered Hopes

So much for the Messianic Hope of 521-516 B. C., but what of the results? All that we know is that on the drama of Jewish history the curtain was rung down for seventy years, from 516-444 B. C. But that silence is a revelation. Zerubbabel, whether Persia intervened at the dramatic moment or not, disappeared forever from history. The promised kingdom was a house of cards, a fantastic dream, a delusion that vanished before a wave of the hand of Persia. The joy of that day was quenched in sorrow. The Messiah of God, the hope of Israel was a broken reed that pierced the hand that leaned on it, and again God was not in the storm or in the earthquake. He was not with his people, in the manner of their expectation.

This frustration of high hope challenges our patient study. Because this hope was shattered and because such episodes have been misinterpreted, we owe it both to the Scriptures and to ourselves to scrutinize all the facts.

In general, we note that shattered hopes are always an integral part of human history. They mark all the highways of life. The story of our laboratories is one long tale of failure, gladdened only here and there by a success. One of our drugs, "Specific 606," tells the story. Six hundred and five experiments, each carefully prepared, each prayed over, each expectantly tested and each a failure. That is science, that is life. Like science, life achieves only by the trial-and-error method. But let us make no mistake, each failure may be essential to success. Like climbing the Himalaya peaks, wisdom and knowledge are gained only by stern endeavor and keen observation, by retracing steps, by feeling the way through fog and storm cloud, by perpetual reconstruction in the light of accumulating facts. Thus are the frontiers of truth pushed back and the ignorance of yesterday gives place to the knowledge of tomorrow. Such

also is the pathway of Revelation. Shattered hopes prove to be the road-signs, signaling to those who can read, danger, detour or dead stop.

This general fact, that divine revelation often comes through shattered hopes, is amply confirmed by a review of the Zerubbabel episode. It required some seventy years for Jewish thinkers to reconstruct their hope, but like the " Boston Tea Party " it left an indelible impression on all later history. We would note three conclusions that may be drawn from this study.

The first is, that a Prince of the House of David was inadequate to be the Messiah. Staking so much on a man and a moment in history had proven a tragic venture. Further, even the most honored member of that dynasty had not been beyond criticism, and none had ever lifted the Kingdom up to the level of the common hopes. Religious ideals had leaped beyond the tarnished figures of history. Never again in Scripture is the Davidic dynasty more than an earthly symbol for a heavenly reality. Henceforth the Messianic confidence is not in human personality. A teacher with divine wisdom and superhuman patience, the anointed priest, the vicegerent of God, a being with semidivine characteristics, these replace the warrior and the prince. In fact, the central figure in the national hope of Israel from this time on, is God himself. He alone is recognized as the ruler and the deliverer. Here was a transition from faith in human personality to faith in God. The prophet Zechariah uttered a significant word, which presents a foundation principle of religious life, " Not by might nor by power but by my spirit." This is the permanent fact in life. Men and dynasties, institutions and organizations, by this principle are rendered transitory. No king was good enough, no dynasty strong enough to function as the chief figure in the Messianic Hope for more than a few generations. This was one of the lessons taught by this strange episode.

The second lesson learned from this tragedy is parallel to the first. It is, the Messianic Kingdom is spiritually conditioned, that is, is based in character, and hence is as inclusive as the human family. It knows no boundaries of race or nation, of custom or language. It is universal. When, seventy years later, we are again able to take up the thread of Jewish history, the kingdom idea has been displaced by that of the religious community. Occasionally a belated dreamer was obsessed by the idea of an earthly kingdom. A few tribal revolts inevitably attached themselves to old out-moded hopes. Eschatology had to speak in terms of the kingdom. But on the whole the term was but the symbol of ethical and spiritual realities. Jehovah had taught the people through the discipline of disappointment, that the kingdom of David, as such, was a futility and from the best thinking it disappeared forever.

Henceforth, the religious community became the chief pattern of the Messianic Hope. Thus, religion largely freed from secular alliances, was the better able to concentrate on affairs of head and heart. Under the kingship, pagan cults had prospered, child sacrifice, sun worship and abominable fertility rites had debauched Israel. Now, Judaism untrammeled by such contacts, in part banished the foreign cults, purified her courts from idolatry, enriched her worship by ritual and song and sought to nourish the inner life of the people. Excluded from temporal power, to the profit of the whole world, Judah specialized in religion. That gala day in Jerusalem in 516 B. C., that to the casual observer proved a fiasco, in very truth was a great day for the religion of Judaism. No less important than this, the inner characteristics of the new kingdom, were the new boundaries. A religious community whose only acknowledged head was God, could be limited only by the interests and the power of that God. But from the eighth century B. C., Jehovah had been acknowledged as a God of righteousness, and from the beginning of the sixth century he had been declared as the One, like unto whom there was none else. Such a concept knows no age, no sex, no race, no nation. That was ethical monotheism in theory. The Zerubbabel episode proved that Jehovah was not very much interested in the little group of ardent Jews in and around Jerusalem. In fact, an ethical deity could not be so provincial, nor could he play favorites. Henceforth the kingdom was not only conceived of as spiritual but as world wide. The Messianic Hope thus became international. Again the sorrows of the Jews in 516 B. C. proved to be the pathway to the loftier vision.

The third lesson is that prophetic inspiration always takes place in local history and is limited by the personal equation. The prophet even in his most inspired moments was limited by his humanity. Divine hopes have always taken form in human molds. The problems treated, the language used, the range of information, the thought forms were always peculiarly provincial. However, herein lies the thrill of living, and the reality of religious experience. It is our human senses that register sense perception, our human minds that respond to stimuli. But just here lies the limitation of all revelation. As human beings we are limited. Our physical senses are severely circumscribed. Our eyes take in and that often vaguely, the color variations of but one chromatic scale. But the scientist tells us that in the universe of light there are 64 chromatic scales. Then, at best, we are about sixty-three sixty-fourths blind. We are told that our ears can detect sound vibrations only between thirty and forty thousand per second, but scientific instruments detect innumerable sounds both below and above that range, to which all are oblivious. All of us

then are at least partially deaf. As with sight and sound, so must it be in the much more difficult and more delicate world of concept or thought. We would not question that there may be such a thing as absolute truth, but the understanding of it, or the expressing of it, would seem to lie beyond human attainment.

Truth, as we know it, does not come as the result of a draught of amber liquid in a chalice of gold from the hand of God. It comes through the midnight oil in the laboratory, through prayer and fasting, not that deadly routine of pious platitudes, the easy resort of dying ecclesiasticism, but that reverent and intense application to perplexing problems that brings pallor to the cheek and perspiration to the brow. It comes always through human processes, in human experience. Truth, as we know it, has never been standardized and where this has been attempted, the result, like last year's automobile, soon becomes a museum piece.

In the light of this general fact, it would seem that the term infallible applied to any message that came through human personality involves a psychological absurdity. Our illustration is ample evidence this is true in regard to the books of Haggai and Zechariah. These prophets were sure that Zerubbabel was the signet ring on the finger of Jehovah, but that signet ring never in any real sense expressed kingly authority. The hope of these prophets was an illusion. They were mistaken. Then, what of it? When Paul wrote "we who are alive that are left shall together with them be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air," was he correct? Does it not seem that something is wrong in Matthew 16:28, where it says, "there are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom"?

History compels us to admit that the religious leaders in the time of Zerubbabel were in error. They did not see all of the sixty-four chromatic scales that God from the beginning had flooded over the horizons of human life. They believed the short span of colors they could see to be the whole rainbow arch of the truth of God. They did not hear all the blended symphonies in which the Almighty was calling to the children of men. They caught a few vibrations to which their ears were attuned, and that was authoritative to them. Such limitations were the penalties of their humanity. They were men of like passions and psychology with ourselves.

Admitted that these prophets were mistaken, that their predictions did not come to pass, then what of it? Was it greatly to their discredit that they failed to unfold what the years had in store for the people of Judah? Would we wish them to have been clairvoyants, conducting séances in

darkened chambers, or wayside gipsies reading teacups for the idle passer-by? Delphic oracles or their counterpart are central in the religion of every pagan people. But such things make no contribution to healthy character or to the Kingdom of God. They belong to the lower not the higher strata of life. They are not of faith.

Then if we pass light judgment on these prophets because they did not read accurately the signs of the times, let us not forget that they signally succeeded. They faced their problem seriously, they devoutedly waited on Jehovah, they arrived at clear-cut convictions and threw themselves whole-heartedly into the venture. The temple was built, worship was reestablished and purified and the cause of true religion was promoted. Their writings were honored by the rabbis, and they are now in the Christian Scriptures, a stimulus to every adventurous spirit, a warning to every faddist. The failure of these leaders was superficial, their achievement was a moral triumph of permanent and universal importance.

History has never condemned the spirit of adventure. Scripture has pilloried the gifted man, who fearful of consequences, has buried his talent in the earth, and has condemned the church that was neither cold nor hot. These prophets honored in the canon and honored by history were adventurous servants of God preparing the way of our Lord.

From this episode in the Messianic Hope, two facts greatly impress us. The first is that men of like passions with ourselves were the leaders of their people and the revealers of God. This places every Christian minister in direct succession to the prophets and the apostles. Therefore young men, let no man shackle you or rob you of your responsibility. " Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit " urges you into the hidden deeps of your own nature and into the secret place of the Most High. All the resources of the prophets are open to you. The other lesson is that the Messianic Hope was not a static idea. It was an ideal that ever adapted itself to changing conditions, breaking through ancient patterns and institutions, enlarging its boundaries and purifying its content, ever growing as men of God were the better able to understand his eternal purposes. Then let no hindrance prevent us from adventure in the Kingdom of God which today is in the making. " Not by might nor by power," not necessarily by ancient traditional patterns nor by modern erudite phraseology, not by institutions hallowed by antiquity nor by organizations, the offspring of the most approved scientific research, " not by might nor by power " but by the living spirit of the living God, operating as always in the heart and mind of living men and women. This was the watchword of the prophets.

# HEGEL'S INFLUENCE IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SITUATION

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN
Professor of Philosophy, Boston University

To trace the influence of the thought of any man is a complicated task. One is always in danger of exaggerating the deeds of the hero of one's momentary attention; every idea that faintly resembles that of the hero looks to the eye of the intellectual detective like a clue to the hero's influence. When, as in the present study, the problem is not solely that of tracing literary influence, but rather of investigating influence on actual social situations, complications multiply. Does a mere philosopher have an appreciable influence on the actual course of history? Marxists more Marxian than Marx himself tell us that the "ideology" of a period is always a product of the economic conditions of the period. Ideas then would be effects, not causes. Marx himself soberly teaches that the conditions influence man as much as man influences conditions; but he was a scholar, and not a "Marxian." If Marx is right, then ideas may have a real effect on events; but the agreement of events with ideas is no proof that the ideas caused the events.

While we have to beware of overestimating the influence of ideas, we have also to beware of underestimating their influence. The furore against intellectualism has in these days reached such a pitch that it requires some courage even to mention ideas. An underestimate of ideas is a commoner error today than an overestimate of them. We hear it said that Christianity is a product of the social conditions in the Mediterranean world of the first century; but if Jesus had expressed no ideas and Paul had formulated no theological concepts, is it not impossible that Christianity should have been even approximately what it is? If there had been no John Locke, could there have been eighteenth-century French philosophy? And without Voltaire and Rousseau and the Encyclopædists would the French Revolution have been what it was? Without those same ideas, would the Declaration of Independence have been written, or the American Revolution have run the same course? If there had been no religious ideas in Germany, would not Reichsbischof Müller have had an easier time? Ideas are dynamite.

With these preliminary cautions out of the way, let us go directly to our main problem, that of Hegel's influence in the contemporary social situation.

If you consult a considerable number of present-day philosophers and theologians about Hegel, they will readily inform you that Hegel is antiquated, obsolete, and utterly without important influence today. The less they have read recently of Hegel and of current social philosophy the surer they will be of their opinion. In answer to Croce's question, "What is living and what is dead in the philosophy of Hegel?" they answer: Living, none; dead, all.

But a brief survey of Hegel's actual influence shows the superficiality of this popular judgment. Hegel doubtless erred at many points, but for good or for ill he is today one of the most living of philosophers. His logic has stimulated Bradley and Bosanquet to write two of the most important contributions to logical theory that England has produced in a century. Hegel's metaphysics has produced neo-Hegelian movements in Italy (Croce and Gentile), in Germany (Glockner and Haering), in Holland (Wigersma and Telders), in Great Britain (T. H. Green, A. E. Taylor's earlier phase, the Scotch school), and in America (the St. Louis school, Royce, Calkins, Creighton). The history of philosophy was first conceived as a connected whole by Hegel, and all of the important histories written since his day have been affected by his insights; this is especially true of Erdmann and Windelband. Hegel's lectures on æsthetics have influenced the development of that discipline, and his conception of the social significance of art and of the application of organic logic to beauty have been widely recognized.

Philosophy of religion owes much to Hegel. In the first place, the development of biblical scholarship in the nineteenth century would have been very different had it not been for the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism; and that school was pure Hegelian dialectic applied to the New Testament. In the second place, the neo-Hegelian philosophy of religion, as expressed in Pfleiderer, the Cairds, and in many of the Gifford lecturers (including Royce) was a main current of Anglo-American religious thought for half a century. The question before us now is not whether the Hegelian absolutism is true, but whether it has been and is influential. No student of philosophy of religion can deny Hegelian influence in that field.

Likewise the philosophy of history owes much to Hegel. To this day, no one can hope to make any headway in that field without coming to terms with Hegel.

But the chief intellectual influence of Hegel has been in the field of social philosophy. When Max Horckheimer took the chair of Social Philosophy at Frankfurt-am-Main in 1931 (a chair that is now, alas, in the hands of the Nazis), he said in his inaugural lecture:

Idealism in Hegel became essential social philosophy. The philosophical understanding of the collective whole in which we live, and which furnishes the soil for the achievements of absolute culture is, according to Hegel, also the knowledge of the meaning of our own being in its true value and content.

Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* deserves a place along with Marx's *Capital* and Darwin's *Origin of Species,* as one of the most influential books written in the nineteenth century. The social process as a dialectic movement, the state as true universality and rationality in which alone the individual finds his meaning, the philosophical justification of monarchy and war, the interpretation of the state as the expression of the absolute spirit in the world, the rejection of all atomistic and laissez-faire theories, the superiority of the Germanic race and state—all of these ideas have been at work in the thought and conduct of European humanity to a greater or less degree ever since Hegel wrote.

If anyone supposes that Hegel is intellectually dead today, let him consider the revival of idealism in both America and Europe. Two years ago, Professor Clifford Barrett edited the volume called *Contemporary Idealism in America* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), to which twelve American idealists, all more or less influenced by Hegel, made contributions. Just now Dr. Ernst Harms in Zürich is launching a philosophical annual called *Idealismus,* to which idealists in every civilized nation are contributing. If anyone supposes that Hegel is politically dead, let him consider socialism, communism, and Fascism. Hegel is a live subject, as we shall see.

It must, however, be recognized that there was a period following the death of Hegel when his influence was dormant. The rise of British neo-Hegelianism was taken by many as a proof of the maxim that "good German philosophies, when they die, go to Oxford." At any event, after Hegel's death, his philosophy suffered both internal and external misfortune. Internally it split into three wings—the center, right, and left, thus illustrating the Hegelian dialectic. Externally it confronted the rise of mechanistic physics and the growth of capitalism and the machine age, all of which were unfavorable to any philosophy at all, especially to idealism. But the past decade has seen this "dead" philosophy experience a resurrection.

The celebration of the hundredth anniversary of Hegel's death in 1931 was the occasion for a renewal of interest in Hegel, and scholars made the discovery that his philosophy was still full of meat for our age. Glockner reprinted the whole of Hegel's works, to take the place of the old edition which had gone out of print; and he is undertaking the preparation of a Hegel-lexicon, which will go far toward unifying our knowl-

edge of Hegelian philosophy. Georg Lasson has been publishing a critical edition of the Hegelian texts on the basis of many manuscripts hitherto unknown or neglected; and since Lasson's death the task is being carried on by others. An international society, called the Hegel-Bund, has been formed, and has held three congresses. If Hegelian idealism was dormant, its hibernation seems to be at an end. In its twentieth-century form, it will become something very different from what it was in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, but it will never cease to learn from the insights and also from the errors of Hegel. Even John Dewey, who thinks he has cast off the spell of idealism, wrote as recently as 1930:

> Were it possible for me to be a devotee of any system, I still should believe that there is greater richness and greater variety of insight in Hegel than in any other single systematic philosopher. . . Acquaintance with Hegel has left a permanent deposit in my thinking.[1]

Whatever one may think of Hegelian idealism and its influence, the social situation today stands to an amazing extent under the sign of Hegel. This may be proved very simply. Without Hegel, Feuerbach would have been impossible. Without Hegel and Feuerbach, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels would have been impossible. Hegel or no Hegel, the infants, Feuerbach, Marx and Engels, would doubtless have been born and survived, it is true; but their ideas and their influence would have been totally different. It is therefore an historical truism to say: No Hegel, no Marxianism; no Hegel, no socialism or communism as they are today. Without the dialectical idealism of Hegel, no dialectical materialism in Russia today. Because Hegel is the prime philosophical source of Marx's thinking, a mechanistic world-view is heretical in Russia today and the materialism which the Soviets avow has much in common with the idealism which they officially reject. Anyone who has examined either the writings of Marx or the untranslated volume of Lenin's works which is wholly devoted to painstaking notes on Hegel cannot for one moment doubt the truth of these statements.

The influence of Hegel on Fascism is perhaps less direct and obvious than on communism, but it is none the less present. One might be inclined to say that movements which require implicit obedience and discourage reasoning are at the antipodes of any philosophy. But when one considers the theory of the state in both Italy and Germany one is quite prepared to find that the Fascisti called Giovanni Gentile, the Hegelian, to reorganize their whole system of education, making him first the min-

[1] In G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague, *Contemporary American Philosophy*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), Vol. II, p. 21.

ister of education and then the president of the Supreme Council of Education and the Fascist Institute of Culture. It is, however, an ironical illustration of the Hegelian dialectic, that the distinguished Senator Benedetto Croce, also an Hegelian, is Mussolini's most open foe in Italy—and that Gentile and Croce are both listed in the *Index* of books forbidden to Roman Catholics. Hegel fights on many fronts today! The living influence of Hegel in our revolutionary society will be understood better if we examine it somewhat more specifically.

The outstanding Hegelian principle that is being applied in current social experimentation in Europe is the organic theory of society. Society is a whole; the parts derive their meaning from the whole. Hegel says, "The interest and right of individuals is made a vanishing factor" (*Philosophy of Right,* sec. 324), and on this bases his justification of war. Only in the state does man reach the universal and the rational; only in the state is man truly free (see sec. 258). The state is an organism (sec. 269). While Hegel held that the rights and freedom of the individual actually come to their true realization in the state, yet there is in his doctrine the germ of the regimentation which prevails in the totalitarian state of Hitler. "The state," says Hegel, "which is the nation's spirit, is the law which permeates all its relations, ethical observances, and the consciousness of its individuals" (sec. 274).

Hegelian influence on the organic theories of Marxist society is evident from what we have said above; but that influence on the Nazi state is less explicitly acknowledged in Germany. However, a Nazi philosopher like Julius Binder of Göttingen sees that the theory of the totalitarian state is strictly Hegelian. In an article on "Der autoritäre Staat" in *Logos* Vol. XXII (1933), he points out that any attempts to justify the Nazi policy on the basis of a relativistic and positivistic philosophy furnish a foundation of sand, which is not adequate to hold up the authoritarian state. Only a theory based on Hegel's view of the authority of the state is adequate. However, it appears that the German practice did not grow up out of a study of Hegel as did Marxian theory and practice; but rather, Hegel appears to be the best support for a practice that arose innocent of ideas. As we have seen, in Italy, through Gentile and others, Hegel has exercised more direct influence on the course of events than in Germany. But substantially all contemporary German theoreticians in the Nazi camp agree in an organic theory of the state that is essentially Hegelian, and, of course, antidemocratic.

A second aspect of Hegelianism that is socially potent today is his dialectic method. One of the ironies of history is the fact that Hegel was a philosopher of movement and "Bacchanalian dance," full of the

contradictions and variety of life, holding that "the Idea is process," with a logic Royce called "the logic of passion"; and yet that a man like William James could see in him only the defender of a "block universe." Hegel's Absolute really resembles the fire of Heraclitus rather than the block of James; and James himself eventually expressed a preference for Hegel over the Hegelians. Unfortunately James did not live to see himself grouped with Hegel and both condemned as "philosophers of life" by Heinrich Rickert.[2]

Karl Marx (and Lenin), on the other hand, saw plainly what James did not see—that Hegel was not a philosopher of the static, but of the moving; not a philosopher of the abstract (which he was forever attacking), but of the concrete. They saw that the Hegelian dialectic was not concerned with the barren concepts of being and becoming, but with all real beings and real becomings. Hence they set Hegel on his head and made out of his dialectic a "dialectical materialsm"—a theory of the interrelation and interdependence of man and his economic environment. Marx and Engels did not hold that man was entirely determined by economic conditions: they held rather that man determines the conditions as much as the conditions determine man, and pointed out that, if man could not take the initiative, revolution would be impossible. They made a brilliant use of the principle of dialectic in the social and economic field, showing that the system of capitalism tends to destroy itself by an increase of production and a decrease of wages until a new synthesis is attained in socialist society. From this application of the Hegelian principle they were able to predict the cycles of prosperity and depression and imperialistic wars in a manner more successful than any other theory. Out of the so-called class consciousness arising from a knowledge of the dialectical movement of society has developed the revolutionary technique of communism. Let no one say that Hegel is dead, or that philosophy is purely an abstract matter, remote from life.

A further influence of the Hegelian dialectic, especially in communist thought, is noteworthy. It is true that the communists have baptized the dialectic as materialism, but the seeds of idealism are there and communism has not escaped them. At the present time in the Soviet Union, anyone who holds to a mechanistic philosophy is a heretic. The orthodox dialectical materialism has a place for wholes, for directive purpose, and for free action; yes, it comes close to belief in a metaphysical purpose which moves through struggle and pain, using the whole material process as its instrument, toward a society of just men made perfect. It would not take much spiritual development for Christian theists and Soviet

[2] H. Rickert, *Die Philosophie des Lebens* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1920), *passim.*

atheists to realize that, after all, they were talking about the same thing. It is to Hegel that we owe this hope of a synthesis that will take place in the future.

In the contemporary social situation there is one great evil, especially influential in Germany, but world-wide in its manifestations. I refer to what the Nazi Alfred Rosenberg calls " the myth of the twentieth century "—the myth of race. In calling it a myth, Rosenberg does not intend to stigmatize it as an error, but rather to glorify it as a symbol of the age. Purity of blood and superiority of the Teutonic race to any other race: what has this to do with Hegel? Surely it has nothing at all to do with him in so far as he was a true philosopher; but Hegel was influenced by his German environment as well as by his pure reason. It was patriotism, and not philosophy that made him view the " Nordic principle " of the Germanic peoples as the ideal fulfilment of the divine and the human, the reconciliation of objective truth and freedom in self-consciousness. It was patriotism, again, that caused him to set the German empire at the highest stage of the historical dialectic, in explicit contrast to the absolute negative and infinite pain of which the " Israelitic " nation is the type (see *The Philosophy of Right,* sec. 358). But the inconsistency of supposing that the accident of space and time which caused Hegel to be born in Germany in the eighteenth century proved the Germanic race to be the noblest race and his own times to be the highest stage of dialectic, was one more instance of the corruption of reason by irrational influences. Hegel sometimes suffered, as A. E. Taylor once remarked, " from an insufficient sense of the sinfulness of sin, as anyone must who identified the Prussian bureaucracy with the Kingdom of God." Unfortunately, however, the mistakes of a great man are even more likely to be influential than his insights into truth; for his valid insights are too profound for the many to grasp, whereas his errors may be precisely their conception of truth. There can be no doubt that the exaggerated importance attached to the Nordic principle by Hegel is one of the many causes of the orgy of race prejudice now raging in Germany and reverberating elsewhere. If Hegel had interpreted races more nearly as he interpreted philosophies, with adequate respect for the truth in each and recognition that the complete truth needs the contribution each philosophy can make, the history of contemporary Germany might have been different.

We have traced Hegelian influence today in the organic theory of society, in the principle of dialectic, and in racialism. A fourth influence is to be found in the great man theory. Mussolini is *Il Duce;* Hitler is *der Führer;* in Russia, Stalin is dictator. All three are great individuals imposing on a whole nation the force of their personality. Of each of

them Hegel might well say, as he said of Napoleon in Jena, "I saw the Weltgeist on horseback."

It would, of course, be no less than absurd to ascribe the rise of these dictators to Hegel alone. But it can hardly be doubted that Hegel's theories have made the Germans, and perhaps the Italians and the Russians, more willing to accept dictatorial leadership. "At the summit of all actions, including world-historical action, stand individuals," writes Hegel. "Each of these individuals . . . is a living embodiment of the substantive deed of the world-spirit" (*Philosophy of Right,* sec. 348). Here we almost hear Hitler's voice in *Mein Kampf,* telling us that he is doing the will of the Creator of the universe. Hegel's definition of the great man is interesting—and again it is a definition of each of the three great dictators we have mentioned. In an addition to section 318 of the *Philosophy of Right,* he declares that "he who expresses and accomplishes what his age desires, is the great man of the age. . . He who does not understand how to despise public opinion, as he hears it in one place and another, will never achieve anything great." Elsewhere (sec. 279) Hegel asserts that "this absolutely decisive moment of the whole is not individuality in general, but one individual, the monarch." The powerful influence of Hegel, accordingly, is thrown into the scales in favor of the Nazi principle of "leadership."

A further doctrine of Hegel's allied with the ones previously mentioned, should be noticed here because of its influence on the German mind of past and present. I refer to the saying: "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht"—"the history of the world is the judgment of the world." Although the words are derived from Schiller's poem, "Resignation," they have been woven so pervasively into the fabric of Hegelian thought that they seem more Hegel's than Schiller's. Hegel, in turn, has woven the concept into the warp and woof of German national consciousness. The idea that the history of the world is the judgment of the world evidences Hegel's great respect for empirical fact and for actual historical power and achievement. Although Hegel says explicitly that might does not decide right, the principle comes uncomfortably near to an identification of the ideal with the actual, and may serve in part to explain, or at least to illustrate, a certain dark undercurrent of ruthlessness in the German character. The great German idealist was an historical pragmatist in a sense. What succeeds in establishing itself must be the movement of the World Spirit; what fails must be a phase of being destined to the fate of subordination.

In the various ways which have been mentioned and in other ways, too, the mighty intellect of Hegel is still casting its spell over civilization,

both for good and for evil. But the influence of Hegel is more than the influence of his ideas. In the principle of dialectic and the recognition of the organic structure of all being, Hegel had perceived two fundamental truths. He may have exaggerated, or distorted, or formalized these truths. His statement of them may not be, and doubtless is not, final. But they are far more than Hegelian theories. They are laws of thought and of being. It is impossible to understand any fact or institution or social situation without considering the laws of its movements; and every human system, and every state of affairs in nature, exhibits a dialectic that is both disintegration and integration. Likewise, the nature of organisms, as wholes with properties that the parts do not have, is no figment of Hegelian imagination. It is a real trait of life and mind wherever they appear in individuals or in groups; and in some sense it is true of the universal whole within which we find ourselves.

But at the same time, it is agreed by Fascists and communists and all objective philosophical observers that Hegel's formulation of these truths is not final, either on the metaphysical or on the social side. He failed to see clearly enough that his own principle of negativity was relentlessly at work within his own age and his own system of philosophy. The monarchical and capitalistic institutions of his own age contained within themselves the dialectic which was to lead inevitably to their own transformation into other forms of political and economic organization. The Fascist and the Communist, the Socialist and the Democrat, all see that the dialectic must march beyond Hegel. Yet, in varying degrees, they repeat his error of supposing that in themselves the final synthesis has at last appeared.

The error is doubtless committed most flagrantly by Fascism. Its totalitarianism, its "coordination" and crushing of freedom, is an attempt to command the sun and the moon to stand still so as to petrify the dialectic at the specific stage which nationalism and capitalism have attained in the Germany or the Italy of the present moment. But sooner or later, it will be seen that the Absolute cannot be held prisoner in the bondage of any moment of time, and the World Spirit will rend the shackles that dictators have forged for it, and will march on. The sun and the moon and the earth will proceed in their movements. Fascism cannot endure.

It is a less simple matter to make predictions about communism, socialism, and democracy. The soberness of Hegel was best manifested by his own reluctance to indulge in prophecy. Yet it may reasonably be said that, if history is moving toward the downfall of capitalism and the rise of a socialistic order of some sort, the form of society which will have the brightest prospects for survival will be that form which

itself best exemplifies the truth of dialectic—a movement which allows and requires opposites to come to expression and then to become reconciled in a higher synthesis. It may not be entirely fantastic to see in some form of socialistic democracy a fulfilment of this ideal. Is not every democratic decision, every genuine vote, every just agreement between workers and employers, an embodiment of the Hegelian dialectic? Is not every instance of violence, and exploitation, and dictatorship a futile attempt of modern Canutes to halt the very tides of the ocean? A little Hegelianism inclineth men's minds to Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin; but depth in Hegelianism bringeth men's minds about to democratic socialism.

# THE TRANSFIGURATION—CREDENTIAL, OR ANSWER?

W. P. BRADLEY, Ph. D., Sc. D.
Millville, N. J.

As it stands in Mark, Matthew and Luke, the Transfiguration is a credential offered to the inner three of Jesus' disciples to certify that Jesus was the Son of God. "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him."

However, there are reasons for thinking that originally this episode performed a function quite different from that of a credential. It is the purpose of this article to point out such reasons, and to inquire (a) as to the probable nature of the event as it originally occurred; (b) as to the use to which it would seem to have been put in the early days of Christian apologetics; and (c) as to the manner in which it came to have its present form.

Before entering directly upon these matters, it will be desirable to canvass a broader subject into which the Transfiguration probably fits. That subject may be introduced in the form of a question:

## When and How Did Jesus Become the Son of God?[1]

It is clear that our question called for an answer at an early date. It is clear also that it was a singularly perplexing question. We are to see that more than one answer was given to it as time passed. Each was a good answer in its day, in the sense that it covered adequately all the exigencies of the situation so far as they had developed up to that time. But unfortunately the question refused to stay answered. Each answer seemed to raise its own special crop of difficulties. These led irresistibly to the next answer, and so on down the series till the fourth and last one. For there seem to have been, in all, four of these answers.

The first of the four was pre-Markan. It is not presented in any of the Gospels *as an answer*. It had ceased to be an answer by the time that Mark, the earliest Gospel, was written, and it appears in that Gospel (as well as in Luke and in Matthew), as a vestigium, in a form which has been sufficiently changed to prevent it from clashing with the answer which Mark himself sponsors.

[1] It may well be that this question was neither the earliest nor the most pressing one which the followers of The Way had to answer. Probably it was antedated by that one which Paul had in mind when he spoke of the "stumbling-block of the Cross" (Gal. 5: 2), that terrible question, If Jesus was the Son of God why did he suffer himself to be betrayed and to be executed by the shameful death of the Cross?

Each one of the other three answers, on the contrary, is sponsored in its own turn by one or more of the Gospels.

Progressive change of base like that which this series of answers embodies, implies pressure of some sort, and much of it. It would be logical to set forth first the changes themselves, and then to consider what kinds of pressure might conceivably have compelled their adoption. But the reverse procedure will be more convenient.

There are three distinct sources from any one of which such pressure might have come: (a) from within the Christian community, (b) from enemies of that community, and (c) from a class of people who were neither adherents of the faith nor its enemies.

At a time of such intensive evangelism there would be considerable numbers of more or less well-disposed, more or less interested individuals who were the subjects of loving and anxious "personal work" on the part of Christian disciples. These persons were not yet fully persuaded. They were not yet ready for the great decision. They were still in the inquiring stage. In the nature of the case the questions of such as these simply had to be answered, if there was any possibility of so doing.

This would be so, not merely because otherwise there was danger of losing the time and effort which had been expended on such questioners. The reason would lie deeper than that. From the Christian view-point, the eternal destiny of such people might be decided for good or ill by the answers which they received.

It seems to the present writer that pressure from this class would be incomparably more compelling and effective than any which may have originated in either of the other two classes. For, speaking by and large, one who is already a believer is usually a most conservative person with respect to his belief. He does not want change, for a change lays him open to the charge of having been mistaken when holding a former view. Consequently he yields to change only when he must. So, it hardly seems that believers would so often, of their own volition, have torn down their theological barns, even for the purpose of building better ones.

As regards the enemies of the faith, and the possible effect of their criticisms, it would seem a fair question whether pressure from them would not have been apt to "set" believers still more firmly in their belief, instead of forcing them to change it.

Whatever its source or sources were, there was certainly great pressure of some sort, and we shall see its results in the successive answers to our question, When and How?

For reasons which will be evident enough later on, it will be convenient to defer for a little the consideration of the earliest of the four

answers, and to take up first the three which are definitely sponsored by the Gospels. These are:

Answer No. 2: Sponsored by Mark;
Answer No. 3: Sponsored by Matthew and by Luke; and
Answer No. 4: Sponsored by the fourth Gospel.

### Answer No. 2—Of Mark

Mark declares (Mark 1:1-3, 9-11) that the beginning of the good news of Jesus the Christ (the Son of God)[2] occurred at the close of his baptism by John at the Jordan.

We observe at once that for Mark the beginning of the good news of Jesus *the Son of God* was *not* the beginning *of Jesus.* According to Mark, Jesus was an adult when his divine Sonship began. And the method was the following:

As he came up out of the water, Jesus saw the heavens rent, and he saw the Spirit, as a Dove, descending *into him,* (εἰς αὐτόν) and a Voice came out of the heavens saying to him, partly in the words of the psalmist (Ps. 2:7; Isa. 42:1), "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

So then, in brief, according to Mark, Jesus became the Son of God at the outset of his ministry, by the entrance of the Spirit of God into him; and the significance of the event was conveyed to him by the heavenly Voice.

Let us now divest ourselves for the moment as completely as possible of any other ideas which we may have as to When and How, and attempt to consider Mark's proposition objectively, on its merits.[3]

It had its decided merits.

For one thing, it made Jesus' death a divine death—the death of the Son of God—fraught therefore with immeasurable significance. The previous answer had already done that, as we shall see in due time.

Further, in the light of this answer, the ministry also of Jesus became divine; his teaching became invested with divine authority; his power to heal became divine power; and the sympathy which he felt for the

[2] Although textual criticism has made it reasonably certain that Mark did not in fact write the words "the Son of God," there appears to be no reason why he should not have done so, since they express exactly the idea conveyed by the heavenly voice, in his account.

[3] It is a vivid illustration of the blinding power which a different belief can exert, that now for nearly two millenniums the rank and file of Christendom has read, and still reads the opening chapter of Mark's Gospel without a suspicion of the fact that an origin of the divine Sonship of Jesus is there being offered, which is both earlier and different from the one which is generally held. That, too, in spite of the fact that Mark's text states plainly and openly, *Here* was the time and *this* was the method.

The statement would be still plainer, of course, if our English versions should read "*into him*" instead of "*upon him*" as they do.

poor, the despised and the outcast, as well as the practical help which he was so quick to extend to every human need became manifestations of the merciful heart of God himself. These advantages had *not* characterized the previous answer.

Another significant characteristic of Mark's answer is that it makes the Sonship of Jesus *wholly* divine. The tenement, to be sure, is human, but the indwelling and informing Spirit is that of God himself. The previous answer had no such prestige. Neither, for that matter, has the one next following.

But Mark's answer had its difficulties also, plenty of them, and these were not long in making themselves felt.

We must consider some of these, for doubtless they were what led in due time to the next answer.

Mark represents the great event at the Jordan as a purely psychological, mystical experience *of Jesus.* "He saw—into Him—Thou—in Thee" are the descriptive and significant words. There is no hint in Mark that anyone except Jesus "saw"[4] the Dove or heard the Voice, or that anyone else was intended to see or hear. Such an idea seems not to have occurred to Mark.

But it would occur at once to an unbeliever. One of the class mentioned above as not yet entirely persuaded could properly say, That experience might have been a perfectly convincing one to Jesus himself, but as you tell it, it can have no evidential value for anyone else, unless he has already become a believer on other grounds. There seem to have been plenty of people about (Mark 1:5). Did none of them witness anything?

Another perplexing difficulty would arise from the fact that, according to Mark, John the Baptist himself never became a disciple of Jesus; neither did any of John's followers.[5]

But, according to Mark, John was the Forerunner *of Jesus,* the Messiah. When therefore Jesus became the Messiah, the Son of God, John should have ceased his independent work and should have put himself and all his followers at the command of his superior officer, *provided that he knew* that Jesus had become the Messiah. John himself did nothing of the sort, in Mark, and his followers remained separate from, and even mildly competitive with,[6] the disciples of Jesus.

[4] What Jesus is said to have "seen" was strictly not a Dove, but "*the Spirit as* a dove descending" and it was his spiritual, not his physical eye with which he saw it. But for the sake of brevity it will be convenient to refer to the object of his vision as "the Dove."

[5] This matter of the relations between Jesus and John was the subject of a former article, *Biblical World,* Vol. XXXV, pp. 327-338, 396-404.

[6] Mark 2:18; Matthew 9:14; Luke 5:33; Mark 6:29; Matthew 14:12a. Cf. also Matthew 11:2-6; Luke 7:18-23; Acts 18:24 to 19:7.

All of this would have been quite puzzling to one who was contemplating adherence to the new faith, but had not yet decided, and did not purpose to do so till quite sure of his ground.

Again, such a person would be struck by the fact that, according to Mark, Jesus himself not only seemed to find nothing strange in this behavior of John and of John's followers, but that he actually waited till John's work closed before becoming active himself (Mark 1:14, 15. Cf. Matt. 4:12, 17). And even then, his immediate activity seemed more characteristic of a herald of a Messiah *yet to come* than of a Messiah already here—characteristic, in other words, of a successor to John.[7]

On the lips of John the words, "The kingdom of heaven is *at hand*" had meant, The Messiah is soon coming, within touching distance. What appropriateness could the same words have on the lips of a Messiah already here? Those who had so understood the words of John would understand them in the same sense from Jesus.

There is a simple explanation of this particular set of difficulties. In pointing to the baptism as the time when Jesus became the Son of God, Mark has added a new and alien element to the more primitive tradition regarding that event. This new element is unconformable, and these difficulties are the result. The much needed adjustment was made by later Gospels.

Once more, Mark's answer leaves the childhood and youth of Jesus entirely out of the picture, out of divine Sonship. Mark has no interest whatever in those early years. In Mark's thought the childhood and youth of Jesus were merely human, and therefore of no importance to the good news. For him, the good news began at the baptism.

In the circumstances, the friendly critic would have been justified in asking, "Just why then did the choice for so exalted and responsible a position fall upon *Jesus?* What qualifications had he shown? What preparatory training for it had he enjoyed?"

Mark, of course, doesn't know. The one single item which Mark does know about Jesus' life before the stupendous event, is the fact that Jesus had just been baptized by John, as a human, and to all appearance, at least, as one of John's converts.

[7] In harmony with such a view, the candidate might have urged the fact that Jesus spoke of John as the equal of any man who had ever lived. "Among them that are born of women" is the well-known phrase (Matt. 11:7-11; Luke 7:24-28).

These words appear to have been part of the early tradition, though they are not found in Mark. They are the sort of words which develop *out* of a primitive tradition, not *into* it.

It will be noted that Jesus cannot have intended to make an exception of himself in this comparison. He himself was born of a woman, and he knew it. However divergent the Gospels are as to the paternity of Jesus, they all agree that his mother was Mary.

Jesus' remark sounds like a spontaneous, natural and altogether admirable tribute to a former inspiring instructor, "Who will never live to see the Kingdom, more's the pity" (Matt. 11:11b).

Perhaps, after all, the worst difficulty which Mark's answer had to encounter may have arisen from the circumstance that in the mythologies of the pagan world divine sonship is commonly based on divine parentage.

One who had been seriously thinking of renouncing his own religion in favor of that of the Christians might easily have felt that in the matter of divine sonship the founder of his own religion was technically better off than Jesus was.

One can see that Mark's answer would be destined to a rather hectic and precarious existence. In spite of its positive merits, it was bound sooner or later to be undermined and to topple. It was indeed undermined and was superseded by a broader and, for a time at least, more useful one. When it was abandoned it was so thoroughly abandoned that multitudes of Christians today would be amazed and probably shocked to learn that there ever was such an answer in good and regular standing.

We are brought thus to

### Answer No. 3—Of Matthew and Luke

Matthew and Luke agree that Jesus was the Son of God, and of Mary. They register thus a notable advance in Christian thinking. For those who adopted this new answer, all of the difficulties raised by the preceding one of Mark were avoided. It is quite needless to say that it was adopted. It is still the standard answer.

By it the divinity of Jesus is extended to cover his entire life. By it Jesus began to be the Son of God when he began *to be Jesus.* Now, for the first time, details of the parentage, the birth and infancy, and the youth of Jesus rank in importance with those of his ministry and of his death.

Such details form the content of the so-called nativity chapters of Matthew and of Luke (Matt. 1:18 to 2:23; Luke 1:5 to 2:52).

The contrast between the two groups of these details is very striking. In Matthew we find:

The Annunciation *to Joseph* (Matt. 1:18-25).
The Birth at Bethlehem (Matt. 2:1a).
The Visit of the Magi (Matt. 2:1b-12).
The Flight into Egypt (Matt. 2:13-15) together with
The Slaughter of the Innocents (Matt. 2:16-18) and
The Return to Nazareth (Matt. 2:19-23).

In Luke, on the other hand, we find:

The Annunciation *to Mary* (Luke 1:28-38).
Mary's Visit of Three Months to Elisabeth (Luke 1:39-56).
The Manger at Bethlehem (Luke 2:1-7).
The Song of the Angels (Luke 2:8-14).

The Visit of the Shepherds (Luke 2: 15-20).
The Presentation of Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2: 22-24).
The Prophesies of Simeon and of Anna (Luke 2: 25-38).
Jesus at Jerusalem at the Age of Twelve (Luke 2: 41-50) and
The Eighteen Subject Years at Nazareth (Luke 2: 51, 52).

The most casual examination of these two lists reveals the significant fact that while they agree upon Bethlehem as the birthplace of Jesus, and upon Nazareth as the home of his youth, Matthew omits all the other details of Luke's list, and Luke omits all the other details of Matthew's list.[8] How are we to account for so nearly complete a divergence? How did each writer fail to learn about precisely the incidents which the other discovered?

These questions are especially apt with reference to the position of Luke in this matter. While Luke was " tracing all things accurately *from the first*" (Luke 1: 3), how could he have missed practically all of Matthew's Nativity details?

The annunciation to Joseph was a private matter, and Joseph would naturally keep it quiet. Luke might easily have missed that, though Matthew did not.

But the visit of the Magi was not private. According to Matthew it was altogether too public for the good of Jesus. It led to the " slaughter of the innocents," which was cruelly public. That event outraged the motherhood of a portion of Southern Palestine. Surely not everyone could have forgotten that.

The flight into Egypt was carried out secretly, of course, but its theological importance was immense. For one thing, it saved the life of the Saviour. For another, according to Matthew, both it and the slaughter were a part of a divine plan which had been revealed to the prophets of old. If events such as these are historic, and if Luke really missed them, then he certainly overrated the thoroughness of his investigations.

On the other hand, if Luke did not miss them, if he knew about them, it would be necessary to inquire why he did not use them. They are at least as good collateral for the support of Answer No. 3 as any of the events which he does use. In particular, in the case now supposed, one would like to inquire as to Luke's attitude toward the plan, or rather as to that idea of the plan which Matthew represents. Did he have a different idea about the nature and content of the plan? If not, his omission of the Flight and the Slaughter would seem to verge on affront to the prophets, and on disloyalty to the plan itself.

[8] When following Mark, Matthew and Luke generally agree in their choice of material. When they are not following Mark, they generally differ in their choice. Since Mark contains no Nativity material the choices of Matthew and Luke are here naturally divergent.

With one important exception, similar observations may be made regarding Matthew's omission of Luke's list, which is more than twice as long as his own. That exception arises from the fact that Matthew, unlike Luke, does not make any claims in regard to the thoroughness of his preparation for the task of Gospel writing, or in regard to the completeness and accuracy of his performance.

As already stated, Matthew and Luke do agree that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, and that he spent his youth at Nazareth. For the rest, they disagree flatly about both places.

According to Luke, Nazareth was the *original* home of Joseph and Mary. But the plan called for the birth at Bethlehem. Luke is therefore at pains to detail a certain political emergency which brought them at the critical time to the City of David, and thus made possible this item of the plan. The temporary nature of their sojourn in Bethlehem accords, of course, with Luke's references to the inn, in which there was not room, and to the manger, in which there was. At the expiration of their sojourn, they went back home to Nazareth as a matter of course.

Not so in Matthew. For Matthew, Bethlehem, not Nazareth, is their *real* home. His account of them begins at Bethlehem. Naturally it contains nothing about inns or mangers. Only when danger threatens at Bethlehem, does Joseph leave home with his family, to seek refuge first in Egypt from Herod, and later in Nazareth from Archelaus. As both of these localities, according to Matthew, were divinely selected and indicated to Joseph as places of refuge, the justifiable conclusion is that otherwise he would not have thought of going to either one.

The disagreement of Matthew and Luke regarding this matter may be summed up briefly by saying that in Matthew the home of Joseph is in Bethlehem, and that only an emergency brings the family to Nazareth, while in Luke Nazareth is their home and only an emergency brings them to Bethlehem.[9]

After all, although the Nativity chapters of Matthew and Luke are surprisingly divergent, it cannot be said that in any considerable degree they are mutually exclusive. Except in regard to Bethlehem and Nazareth, they do not actually contradict each other. It is not impossible to "harmonize" them.

But they do not harmonize readily with the main bodies of the Gospels to which they are attached. A single illustration out of many may be offered from each Gospel.

[9] The reversal of the rôles of these two places exhibited thus by Matthew and Luke is paralleled by another one in the Gospels. According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is in his "own country" when he is in Galilee. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus leaves his "own country" when he leaves Jerusalem and vicinity to go to Galilee (Matt. 13: 54, 57; Mark 6: 1, 4; Luke 4: 16, 24; John 4: 44).

According to Luke's Nativity chapters, Mary is a woman of intelligence and understanding. She utters a psalm of exultation which is perhaps the equal of anything in the Psalter. She listens to every word spoken concerning Jesus, as well as to the words of the youthful Jesus himself, and she ponders them all in her heart (Luke 2:19, 33, 51).

But later, in the same Gospel (Luke 8:19-21), we are told that when Jesus one day was speaking parables concerning the Kingdom and was interpreting them in a crowded house, Mary and his brothers came to the edge of the crowd, wishing that they might speak to him. Their appearance thus as a committee of the whole leaves scarcely a doubt as to the nature of their errand. Jesus himself appears to have had no doubt whatever about it.

When their wish was relayed in to him, he answered that only those who cared to "hear the word of God, and do it" had any claim to be considered as his mother and his brethren.

The conclusion is quite irresistible that in the opinion of Jesus his immediate family had little or no interest in what he considered the word of God, and little or no sympathy with the supreme passion of his heart.[10]

The point is, of course, that one would hardly recognize this Mary as the same one who, in the Nativity chapters, "kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart." The Mary of Luke's Nativity chapters represents a more advanced stage of Christian thought than the Mary of the body of his treatise.

Other illustrations might be given.

To state the situation in more general terms, Luke's Gospel, as a whole, has not accommodated itself to the new view presented by his Answer No. 3. The old wine-skins are not ideal containers for the new wine.

In a similar way, Answer No. 3 has created a situation of unconformability in Matthew's Gospel also.

Matthew opens his Gospel with a genealogy (Matt. 1:1-17) which is designed to show that Jesus was a lineal descendant of Abraham through David. Having traced the line down to Joseph he then pro-

[10] Luke has omitted that similar, but theologically more offensive, incident which we find only in Mark (3:20, 21). Those "friends" too, who considered Jesus crazy ("beside himself") and who thought him deserving of a little friendly violence because he would persist in teaching, with no regard for mealtime, though they are not specifically identified by Mark, were undoubtedly "his mother and his brethren." Who else? No "friends" of Jesus, who cared to "hear the word of God, and do it" could possibly have harbored such a thought regarding Jesus as these did, or have conspired to interrupt him by force in the midst of his passionate work.

One is reminded of that other saying of Jesus, That a prophet can find honor almost anywhere except among—*his own kin* (Mark 6:4).

ceeds in his chapters on the Nativity to show that Jesus was *not* the son of Joseph.[11]

Other illustrations from Matthew could be given. Matthew's Gospel as a whole would require considerable editing to bring it into smooth conformity with his Nativity chapters.

In the next place, it is easy to see that Answer No. 3, as presented in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, is in irreconcilable conflict with Answer No. 2 of Mark. If Jesus became the Son of God at conception, then he did *not* become the Son of God after he had grown to manhood, and vice versa. If either one of the two answers is correct, the other one cannot be.

Such being the case, it might naturally be supposed that both Matthew and Luke would omit Mark's account of the baptism, with its Dove and its Voice, in order to avoid an awkward and embarrassing clash. They do not. Instead, they edit it (Matt. 3:13-17; Luke 3:21, 22). They rephrase it in such a way that it becomes transformed from the date at which, and the manner in which, Jesus became the Son of God, into a testimony to others than Jesus—that is, to witnesses—of that earlier sonship which, according to their new answer, Jesus had already enjoyed for years. As the baptism appears in Matthew and Luke, it has become a *credential.*

This transformation is complete in Matthew. It is only partial in Luke. Both of these Gospels bring the Dove *upon Jesus* instead of *into* him (ἐπ' αὐτόν, instead of εἰς αὐτόν). Luke adds that the Dove descended "in bodily form," a fact which would contribute still further to that conspicuousness which Luke contemplates and Mark does not. Further than this Luke does not go.

On the other hand, Matthew proceeds to change the words of the Voice from "Thou art . . . in thee" to "This is . . . in whom." In their new form, these words are obviously addressed not to Jesus but to others.

Even yet Matthew is not done. According to him, not only had Jesus long been the Son of God, and had always known it, but John the Baptist also knew it, *before the baptism.*[12] Because he knew it, he protested against baptizing Jesus at all, insisting that the ceremony should be performed the other way around, and yielding only when ordered to do

[11] Matthew 1:18-25. This is the situation as presented in the standard text from which our revised New Testament was translated. The statement made at this point by certain ancient texts, that Joseph *begat* Jesus, which may turn out to be exactly what Matthew originally wrote, is in entire accord with Matthew's purpose in tracing the genealogy. However, it cannot be said to widen by very much the conflict which already exists between his genealogy and his Nativity chapters.

[12] To urge that John refused to baptize Jesus because he recognized the freedom of Jesus *from guilt,* is of course simply another way of expressing John's recognition of Jesus *as divine.*

so by his superior officer. Clearly, when Matthew set himself to dispose of Answer No. 2, *as an answer,* he aimed to do it as thoroughly as possible.[13]

Divine parentage became thus the established answer to the great question. But while it avoided the difficulties attendant upon Answer No. 2, it was not without difficulties of its own. Just one of these may be mentioned.

It may be questioned whether the friendly outsider, perhaps a member of that class whose views have already proved so fruitful, would find Answer No. 3 any more helpful toward a decision to join the Christian community than Answer No. 2 was. If it was now urged that Jesus became the Son of God by divine parentage, he might repeat his former reminder that the Founder of his own religion stood on the same footing. He might perhaps be pardoned for the feeling that in this respect the Christians had done no more than catch up with the adherents of his own faith. So why should he change faiths on that account?

Indeed, it would seem as if Christians themselves must in time have become a little restive under a belief which, to all except Christians, would seem to class Jesus not only with the "gods many" (1 Cor. 8:5) of the pagan world, not many of whom could be considered even decently moral, but also with the merely great ones of earth, from the Pharaohs to the Cæsars. It would indeed have been surprising if at least some of the early Christians did not begin to long for a less conventional basis than divine parentage on which to set up the unique claims of their Master to divinity.

However that may have been, in process of time they did acquire a new and better basis. We have now to consider one further answer, namely,

### Answer No. 4—Of the Fourth Gospel

The writer of the fourth Gospel at last sees clearly that no attempt to fix upon a time or a method in connection with the great problem can ever be permanently satisfactory or defensible. And so, in principle, he abandons that phase of the matter entirely.

He goes much further. In his preface (John 1:1-18) he denies that Jesus was ever merely a *Son* of God. Jesus was *God.* He *always* was God, whether in heaven, as at first; on earth; or again in heaven, as now.

[13] As to this matter of the recognition of Jesus by John, we have three contrasting bits of testimony. In the fourth Gospel (John 1:31-34), the Baptist states that he did not know that Jesus was the Son of God till he saw the descent of the Dove. In Matthew, as we just saw, he knew it *before* the Dove descended, while in Mark, as was pointed out above in the discussion of Answer No. 2, he never knew it.

God, the "Word, became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory." Since he always was God, he never "became." [14]

God's sojourn in the flesh becomes thus an episode between two eternities, if one may be pardoned for subdividing eternity. Let us have done, this writer seems to say in his preface, with such immature notions as Lo, *here,* or Lo, *there* was the date at which; *this* or *that* was the date at which; and *this* or *that* was the method by which, Jesus "became." If we have attained to any maturity of intelligence and understanding, let us rise above such futilities.

Standing on such a platform, it was as easy for this writer to drop the Nativity as to drop the augmented baptism of Mark, or the scene which serves as the setting for Answer No. 1, which we have yet to consider.

The fourth Gospel does drop all three of these. Need we wonder why? For really, the differences which distinguish the three from one another, and which loom so large when viewed at close range, require telescopic power to resolve them across the interstellar gap which separates them from the Answer of the fourth Gospel.

However, it is one thing to glimpse a great new idea, and quite another thing to level up consistently to it. The fourth Gospel experiences as great difficulty in maintaining the high standard set by its introductory verses as Matthew and Luke did with that of their Nativity chapters, or as Mark did with respect to his revised baptism.

Although the proof of this statement can be found almost anywhere in the fourth Gospel, only one or two illustrations need be given.

For example, this writer continues to use the expression "*Son* of God" with considerable frequency in the body of his Gospel,[15] although his preface has made it obsolete. Similarly, he uses the expression "*only begotten* (Son)," though far less frequently. The phrase occurs four times (John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18). Curiously enough, two of the four occurrences are found near the end of the introduction itself. The first of the two has been softened by the words "as of."

Now it will be recalled that although Matthew and Luke are the sponsors of the belief that Jesus was a begotten Son, they never use that

[14] As will have been observed, it is the probable psychological aspects of this progressive substitution of one answer for another with which this article is chiefly concerned. The existence of the successive answers, and the probable causes which led to them have seemed more immediately important than a discussion of the source or sources from which the writers may have derived the substance of the answers.

The Alexandrian flavor of the passage just referred to has long been recognized.

[15] John 1:34, 49; 5:25; 9:35; 10:36; 11:4, 27; 19:7; 20:31.

To these references should be added those in which the words "the Son" are used alone, but with the obvious meaning, "Son of God" (John 3:17, 35, 36—twice; 5:19—twice, 21, 22, 23—twice, 26; 6:40; 8:36; 14:13; 17:1—twice).

word as part of a title for him. Naturally then neither of them uses the limiting word "only" in the same connection.

It would really seem therefore that the Christians, at some period between the date of the third Answer and the fourth, having become all too aware that Jesus, as a "begotten" Son, was being classed by outsiders with the many begotten sons of pagan mythologies, sought at first to surmount the difficulty by denying that there had been any other divinely begotten sons, in order to avoid still another shift in their own views as to the date and method of Jesus' Sonship.

Whether they would be likely to achieve any marked success along this line may be doubted. It is much easier to tell a person of another faith that his Lord was not a Son of God, than to win his assent to the proposition. The interesting thing about the situation is that this writer, who in principle has pointed out the futility and short-sightedness of insisting on any dates and methods whatsoever in connection with Jesus' divinity, should continue, doubtless by force of habit,—not only his own habit, but more especially perhaps the habit of his readers,—to use expressions which give him the appearance of holding a view which he begins his Gospel by denying.

If he really hoped to replace the Answer of Matthew and Luke by his own, he could hardly have employed a method more likely to defeat his object than to use phrases which are appropriate enough to their Answer but not at all to his own.[16]

Of course, as a matter of fact, Answer No. 4 never did replace Answer No. 3. At this very day, after the lapse of nearly twenty centuries, the overwhelming majority of Christian believers, while doubtless accepting Answer No. 4 in some highly tenuous and theoretical way, are still marching under the banner of a *Son* who was *"begotten."*

Having now reviewed in sequence Answers No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4, each of which is definitely sponsored by one or more of the Gospels, we turn at last to

### The Pre-Markan Answer No. 1

In preparation for this (probably) earliest of all the answers to the question, When and how did Jesus become the Son of God? so far at least as we can trace those answers in the Gospels, let us place ourselves at the latter end of the series of the three and review them in reverse,

[16] The present writer can testify that the use of the word "begotten" in the fourth Gospel does mislead many into supposing that its writer was a believer in the Virgin Birth, regardless of the fact that he has dropped the Nativity altogether.

Indeed, his continuous use of such expressions, in spite of the first four verses of his introduction, would almost lead one to wonder if he himself had fully sensed the revolutionary significance of his own introduction.

noting as we do so that the duration of the divinity which is claimed for Jesus *decreases* as we pass from each answer to the one immediately preceding.

Fourth Answer: His divinity covered *all eternity.*
Third Answer: His divinity covered *his entire earthly life.*
Second Answer: His divinity covered *his ministry.*
First Answer: His divinity covered

Thus we have a right to expect that the first answer of all will assign the shortest duration of all to Jesus' divinity. But that divinity simply must include the *death* of Jesus, otherwise it would have had no apologetic value. In other words, we must expect to find the scene of Answer No. 1 somewhere near the *end* of Jesus' ministry.

In a similar way the reversed series is capable of suggesting at least something as to the method by which divinity was held to have been conferred upon Jesus in Answer No. 1.

Fourth Answer: Jesus *was God* in very essence.
Third Answer: Jesus was *divinely begotten.*
Second Answer: The adult Jesus became the *tenant* of the Spirit of God.
First Answer:

Clearly, the "method" of Answer No. 1 will be a shallower one, so to speak, one philosophically less profound than that of any one of the later three.

And so we are brought at last to the event which is now known as the Transfiguration of Jesus (Mark 9:2-9; Matt. 17:1-9; Luke 9:28-36). But since the story in its present form or forms has clearly been subjected to editing by Luke, Matthew and Mark, and doubtless also by someone still earlier than Mark, it becomes important to restore it, so far as possible, to its probable original form. This should not be much more difficult than to restore the story of the Baptism to the form which that event had before Mark introduced the Dove and the Voice into it in the interest of his Answer No. 2.

In making this attempt, it will be necessary to bear in mind what Jesus at this time felt it his duty to do (Mark 8:31-38; Matt. 16:21-26; Luke 9:22-26). He had been spending much time in proclaiming his message in regions where at the worst it did not bring him into mortal danger. He now felt that the message should be carried into the very stronghold of those who had already shown themselves to be his enemies by a variety of petty annoyances (Mark 2:6, 16, 24; 3:1-6, 22; 7:1-13; 8:11-13, together with other similar passages in Matthew and Luke). With the fate of John the Baptist before him, his mind was filled with fore-

boding. He understood only too well that his duty involved the gravest risks, not only to his life but to his message as well.[17]

From the very beginning of his ministry Jesus had been accustomed in times of trouble or perplexity to withdraw from the scenes of his public activities[18] and to spend a whole night, if need be, in prayer, meditation and decision.

Avoiding the crowd on the occasion now under consideration, and even leaving nine of his disciples at a distance, he took the more favored three with him to the summit of a certain height, to canvass the "great proposal." If he hoped for encouragement, sympathy, or even plain companionship from the three during that night, he was doomed to disappointment, for they proceeded to spend it, or at least most of it, in sleep, as would seem to have been their usual custom.[19]

Thus, they never knew in full the details of that night's terrible hours. However, toward dawn they half awoke, to find themselves shivering in a dense fog. Out of the fog they heard words which they recognized as familiar passages from the Law and from the Prophets. Jesus was facing his problem in terms of the age-old hopes and convictions of his race.

Suddenly, as the light increased, they heard a great voice above them quoting freely the words of the Psalmist, "Thou art my beloved Son" (Ps. 2:7). Becoming more fully awake, they noticed the fog thinning rapidly, till suddenly Jesus stood before them—alone! But his garments, shining in the level morning light, dazzled their sleep-heavy eyes, and his face was aglow with a great decision (cf. Mark 9:30-32; Matt. 17:22, 23; Luke 9:43b-45).

The more or less blurred memory of these events remained with the three. Later, when an explanation of Jesus' apparently shameful death was imperative, and when the disciples had come to the conviction that his death was in reality a divine death—one item of colossal significance in an eternal divine plan—then sooner or later they would be confronted with the question, For how long a time previous to his death had Jesus been divine?

[17] In this matter we are following the clear implication of the synoptic Gospels that Jesus went to Jerusalem only once after his ministry began. That was the visit which ended his ministry and his life.

In the fourth Gospel Jesus passes frequently from "his own country" (John 4:44), Jerusalem and Judea, to Galilee and back (John 1:43; 2:13; 4:3, 43; 5:1; 6:1; 7:2-10; 11:54; 12:1).

[18] Mark 1:35-38, 45; Luke 5:16; Mark 3:13; Luke 6:12; Mark 6:30, 31, 46; Matthew 14:13a, 23; John 6:15; Mark 7:24; 8:27; Luke 9:18.

[19] We are not likely to forget the night in the Garden, when the same three fell asleep three times, in spite of an initial request of Jesus that they remain awake *with him*, to which were added two remonstrances of his, when he found as many times that they had not done so.

At the first, they would not have thought of that. But when they now thought of it, what could have seemed more natural, more inevitable, than that they should recall that luminous incident on the Mount? "What if that should have been the beginning of his divinity?" "Don't you remember?" etc.

Such, in outline, would seem to have been the genesis of Answer No. 1. It would soon be quite clear to the disciples that Jesus became the Son of God by illumination and by annunciation, on the Mount.

As soon as this general idea took possession of the disciples, the various items of their recollection would crystallize around it. The real illumination would not now be thought of in physical terms, of course, but as an inner illumination of the spirit and of the will of Jesus. The physical illumination which they had actually witnessed, would now be recognized as the outer manifestation of the heavenly light within him. The vocal quotations from the Law and the Prophets, with which Jesus had confirmed his conviction of duty, must surely have been uttered personally by Moses, the lawgiver, and by Elijah, that representative prophet of the olden time.[20] Both of these had sought by their words to prepare him for his new status. Similarly the voice proclaiming the words, "Thou art," would now be recognized as a voice from heaven, inaugurating him into that status.

Such then would be Answer No. 1 in essentially the form which it probably assumed in the pre-Gospel period of its acceptance and currency. It would be difficult to say how long or how generally it was current. But it would be a good answer, so far as it related to the divine death of Jesus.

However, in the light of the experience of later answers, it is easy to see that just because it was practically limited to Jesus' death it could not be a permanently satisfactory answer. That very limitation would prove its undoing. For if Jesus did not become the Son of God until the incident of the Mount, then practically all of his ministry of preaching and teaching was a purely human ministry, with no more than human authority, and his healing ministry could have evinced no more than human skill.

Answer No. 1 therefore could never be anything more than a first way-station in this line of Christian thought. The train simply had to move on presently to the next station, the one which is represented by Answer No. 2 of Mark, as we saw.

[20] It will be observed that the necessary corollary to this conclusion, namely, that Moses and Elijah must then have risen from the dead, offered little or no difficulty. Resurrection from the dead appears to have been easily assumed when circumstances seemed to warrant it. (Cf. Mark 6: 14, 16; Matt. 14: 2; Luke 9: 7, 8; and Mark 8: 27, 28; Matt. 16: 13, 14; Luke 9: 18, 19).

When Mark's answer came, it made Answer No. 1, *as an answer,* just as impossible as Mark's answer became when that of Matthew and Luke appeared. The way in which it was transformed by Mark from a method into a credential is closely parallel with that by which Mark's account of the Baptism was transformed when it was incorporated into the text of Matthew and Luke.

The process is easily followed.

Even in Mark, the connection between the morning sun and the dazzling garments is all but lost. The illumination is mentioned near the beginning of the account instead of near the end of it.

Instead of merely uttering words of support and confirmation *to Jesus,* Moses and Elijah "appear" in person *to the disciples.* Appropriately therefore the fog cloud has retired from the early part of the event and functions only at the very last, during the proclamation by the heavenly Voice.

Most striking of all, of course, is the change from "Thou art" to "This is." Mark has done to the "Thou art" of the Transfiguration precisely what Matthew did to the "Thou art" of Mark's Baptism.[21]

One item of the original tradition regarding the Transfiguration remains in nearly its primitive form. That is the statement that when at last the disciples suddenly "looked round about they saw no one any more save Jesus only with themselves (Mark, ver. 8). The words "any more" would belong to the same stage of development as the words "appeared unto them."

No doubt one may derive a certain degree of confirmation of the reality of some such development of the Transfiguration story, as traced above, from the statement found in Mark and in Matthew that Jesus told the Three not to mention the matter until they should learn the outcome of the contemplated journey to Jerusalem. Luke omits the share of Jesus in this delay, and simply states that the disciples *did* not mention it "in those days." It would seem clear that the advanced stages of the story

[21] Of course Mark's contribution to this development was not the end of the process. Matthew and Luke continue it.

It was Matthew, as will be recalled, who handled Mark's Baptism most freely. It happens to be Luke who does most to develop Mark's Transfiguration.

After repeating Mark's statement that Moses and Elijah "appeared" to the disciples, Luke adds that their appearance was "in glory." They also, like Jesus, are transfigured, in Luke.

Moreover, instead of merely repeating Mark's statement that the heavenly visitors talked with Jesus, Luke tells what they talked about. He says that they "spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

Further, and perhaps as an answer to the possible objection that the disciples who just previously had been sound asleep might have been misled by "appearances," Luke is careful to explain that while they had indeed been asleep, they were fully awake by the time of the appearance of the visitors, and actually saw them, together with the glory of Jesus himself.

which are presented in these three Gospels *could* not have been told until quite a long time after "those days." [22]

Our review of the list of answers to the question, When and How did Jesus become the Son of God? is now completed.

In closing, two suggestions may perhaps be pardoned.

The first is, that the very existence of such a series of answers as the one which has been the subject of this article is sufficient reason for concluding that no one of the Gospel writers knew when or how Jesus became the Son of God.

The second is, that in spite of the heavy pressure to which the disciples must have been subjected, the growth of their ideas on this subject seems to have been very gradual. Each advance, except probably the fourth, was limited in its scope to just those difficulties which had already become irresistible. There was nothing jaunty about the advance; nothing light-hearted. Each step will have been taken after painful searchings of heart and of conscience, and in the matured conviction that it led to a more accurate and complete explanation of the facts of the faith, as they had come to be held. Without entering at all upon the matter of the dating of the individual Gospels, it is not too much to say that the average incubation period of the first three answers could not have been much

CONSPECTUS OF ANSWERS No. 1 TO No. 4

| | *Answer No. 1* | *Answer No. 2* | *Answer No. 3* | *Answer No. 4* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unknown to ..... | ..... | ..... | Mark. | Mark, Matthew, Luke. |
| Sponsored by ..... | No Gospel. | Mark. | Matthew, Luke. | Fourth Gospel. |
| "When?" ..... | Mount of Transfiguration—near *end* of Ministry. | Baptism, *Beginning* of ministry. | Conception. Beginning *of Jesus.* | Never. Always was GOD. |
| "How?" ..... | Divine *Illumination.* | Divine *Indwelling.* | Divine *Begetting.* | *Eternally* GOD. |
| Superceded by ..... | Answer No. 2. | Answer No. 3. | Never. | ..... |
| Transformed by .... | Mark (Matthew, Luke). | Matthew, Luke. | ..... | ..... |
| Into a credential for. | Peter, James, John. | The Baptist, "multitudes." | ..... | ..... |
| Finally dropped by.. | Fourth Gospel. | Fourth Gospel. | Fourth Gospel. | ..... |

[22] Students of the Gospels have not failed to notice that events toward the end of Jesus' ministry are apt to be much more fully developed, even in Mark, than those of an earlier date. The process of development seems to have begun with the later events and to have worked backwards in time. Thus, later events are more fully developed just because they have been subjected to the process for a longer time.

less than a score of years. The gap between the third Answer and the fourth may easily have been several times as long.

In order to facilitate a rapid and comprehensive survey of the entire series of Answers, they will next be tabulated, with respect to (a) the circumstances of their advent; (b) their chief characteristics; (c) their difficulties; and (d) their ultimate fate.

### Summary

A. For evangelistic purposes, especially, Christian disciples found the mere assertion of the divinity of Jesus inadequate. It became necessary for them to answer such questions as, When—How did he acquire divinity? No less than four answers to this particular question are represented in the Gospels. Three of them are sponsored by one or more of the Gospels.

B. (1) Answer No. 1 covers chiefly the death of Jesus. It presented the Transfiguration as the time when, and divine illumination and annunciation as the method by which Jesus became the Son of God.

This answer arose in pre-Gospel days. It appears in Mark in a form so modified as to make it no longer an answer, but a credential. As a credential it does not clash with Mark's Answer No. 2.

B. (2) Answer No. 2 is sponsored by Mark. It covers not only the death, but also the entire ministry of Jesus. It offers the Baptism as the time, and divine indwelling as the method. This answer is partially transformed by Luke, and completely transformed by Matthew, from an answer into a credential. Consequently it does not clash with their Answer No. 3.

B. (3) Answer No. 3 is sponsored by Matthew and Luke, and covers the entire life of Jesus. It offers Jesus' conception as the time, and divine parentage—on the paternal side—as the method.

B. (4) The introduction to the fourth Gospel denies that there ever was a time or a method. Jesus never *began* to be divine. Jesus, the Word, always was—God, whether in heaven or on earth.

The fourth Gospel drops all three of the events with which the three previous answers were connected—the Transfiguration, the Baptism and the Nativity.

C. Each of the last three answers—the three that are sponsored each by one or more Gospels—represents a more advanced stage of Christian thought than the body of the Gospel or Gospels which presents it. No Gospel lives up to the level of the answer which it sponsors. Each uses

expressions and exhibits habits of thought that are quite consistent with the last preceding answer, but not with its own.

D. The chronological sequence of these answers is the same as that of the respective Gospels which sponsor them.

E. The transition from any one answer to the next was gradual. Each change seems to have required a score or so of years. The last probably required much more time than that.

F. The vast majority of Christian believers adhere to Answer No. 3 as the only one possible and all-sufficient. They do not recognize the opening verses of the fourth Gospel as a different answer, a sweeping denial of all the others.

Answer No. 2 of Mark they do not see at all, though it is expressed in plainest terms.

The Transfiguration, in its present form, or forms, would hardly be recognized as even the vestigium of an answer, except by those who are already able to identify the other three.

G. Each answer came as a reaction to pressure, and each avoided the difficulties that confronted its immediate predecessor.

H. The very existence of such a series of answers makes it clear that no one of the Gospel writers knew when or how Jesus became the Son of God.

# THE GENERAL HOSPITAL AS A CENTER FOR THE CLINICAL TRAINING OF THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS

Rev. RUSSELL L. DICKS

In speaking of the General Hospital as a center for the clinical training of theological students,[1] I shall limit myself to those elements which might be duplicated in any general hospital across the land. In other words, I shall speak of the common denominator of the general hospital: that which makes it desirable as a training center for theological students. I shall not stop to point out why clinical training is desirable for the clergyman, but rather what one sees in the general hospital and how one is enabled to see it.

It should be recognized, however, that the progress we have made during the past fifteen months in collecting data and evaluating clinical training in the general hospital field, was possible because of the welcome, encouragement, and cooperation given us at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Especial credit should go to Miss Cannon, Chief of the Social Service, and members of her department, to Dr. Richard C. Cabot for his advice and counsel, to Doctor Bigelow, Superintendent, for his welcome and his willingness that we should try a new plan, and to members of the medical and nursing staff for their cooperation.

Historically, the Massachusetts General Hospital has not been afraid to pioneer or to lend its resources to those who would pioneer. The third oldest general hospital in the country, it has to its credit many great achievements in the conquest of illness. As an institution it was founded for three purposes: for the care of the sick, for teaching, and for research. Throughout its history it has followed these three aims, and it holds that any one who comes within its walls to work shall follow one or all of these purposes.

Through the years the General Hospital has become more and more complex. Within the so-called teaching hospital one now finds, not only a host of skilled and specialized workers, but a group of students representing each specialized field. There are medical students, student nurses, dietary students, social service students, library students, and occupational therapy students. And now come theological students. It is interesting to note that the last group applying to the hospital for admission represents

[1] An address delivered at the Fifth Annual Conference of the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students, September, 1934.

historically the first group there. Even before the medical profession came into existence the church was the lone occupant of the Good Samaritan tradition. Somewhere near the year 300, when it was customary for Christians to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem, the first hospital was founded. At first, a hospital was not a place for the care of sick people; rather it was a hostel where pilgrims met pilgrims. Often, after long journeys, these pilgrims were sick upon arriving in Jerusalem and had to be cared for. Later, as hostels were founded along the route traveled by the Crusaders, each came to have a part set aside for the care of the sick. These sections were called "infirmaries." Quite independent of this movement there developed in the monasteries the practice of caring for the sick. There was no medical profession as such, and nursing as a profession developed only within the past century. Always before that it was the church and only the church that cared for the sick. Now, we who represent the church are coming to the hospitals and asking permission to observe, to work and to teach. The hospital by rights asks, Can you serve while you observe and teach? Our answer is, We can. In fact, we cannot teach until we have observed.

May I call your attention to the fact that of the groups of students listed above, ours is the only one which will not spend most of its active profession in the hospital. The doctor, the nurse, the dietitian, the medical social service worker, the hospital librarian, the occupational therapist—all these will spend their whole professional career working with sick people. The average clergyman, on the other hand, will spend only a part—perhaps the most significant part—of his professional career in work with the sick. Then why should the hospital attract us as a teaching and training center?

It has been rightly said that nothing happens in the hospital that does not happen outside. However, nowhere else in modern peace-time civilization does one find the concentration of intense human experience that is to be met with in the large general hospital. An exhaustive psychological description of illness and what it means to the patient would be endless. It is sufficient to point out, briefly, that in the hospital are people facing serious surgical operations, major social adjustments, long convalescence and death. Human existence is intensified under each of these situations. Fairly often one gets a combination of all of them. Many patients face serious surgical operations, involving major social adjustments; to be followed by a long convalescence. Here is a twenty-one-year-old college football player, who, following an automobile accident, had three operations. In the end nothing could be done about his broken spinal cord. At best, all he can ever expect is to be up in braces, or in a wheel

chair. Is it to be wondered that after four weeks in the hospital he has gotten into such an antagonistic mood that no one bothers to go near him except when absolutely necessary? What is to happen to this boy? One thinks of the psychiatrist, for psycho-therapy; of the social worker, for plans for his immediate and future home care; of the librarian for books; of the occupational therapist for treatment and physical rehabilitation. Is that enough? Has religion anything to offer this boy? If so, how does one go about bringing the forces of religion into play?

Again, here is a thirty-two-year-old architect, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has multiple sclerosis, a progressive disease of the central nervous system for which there is no known cure. He may live six months or he may live ten years, or even longer. He has little money, a wife and child. Because his wife is working it will be possible for them to maintain their own home. While he is not confined to his bed and does not require constant nursing attention, he can read very little and the use of his hands is greatly impaired. He has been active in his church. Now in his time of need he turns to his religion, but to find both religion and minister wanting. The ministers who came to see him freely admitted to the patient's wife that they had nothing to offer in this time of need. In desperation he turns to Christian Science; but his intellectualism is outraged. He sums it up by saying, "My aunt calls it Science; I call it bunk." What has religion to offer either this man or his wife? How can their baby boy, aged four, be kept from becoming warped by the experience through which his parents are passing, and be given a chance to grow into a normal boy? Is this the province of religion? And, if so, on whom will the religionist call for assistance?

In another instance one of our students had his attention called to a twenty-four-year-old boy who was facing death from intestinal obstruction. An operation would save his life. He had refused to permit an operation because of his fear of death—he was "dying anyway." For three days the men on the medical service had been attempting to induce him to agree to an operation. Does religion have anything to offer this boy in order to help him overcome his fear and thus save his life?

All of our students were shown this summer a twenty-eight-year-old man with tuberculosis of the hip. He had been in a plaster cast for two years, and had just his fifth operation. Another patient who came to our attention was a fifty-year-old college professor in a State university, whose entire body, her face in particular, was affected with a serious skin disease. She disliked seeing everybody, including the doctors. One person she admitted freely, a Roman Catholic nurse. The patient was Episcopalian. This nurse had called the patient to our attention and asked

us to see her. Do either of these patients have a need from the standpoint of religion? If so, what is it, and how does one go about meeting that need?

Another student was asked to see a patient suffering with a serious skin disease. Upon introducing himself, the student was immediately told by the patient that she disliked the church and did not believe in religion. To his query as to why, she gave no satisfactory answer. Later, as he was leaving, she said she was glad he had come, and would he come again? What is his next move, and toward what shall he direct his attention when he returns?

I cite the above instances, not to suggest what one does in such situations, but to point out the kind of things one sees in the general hospital. You will note that any one of them might fall to any minister, in any church, at any time. Are our men who go out from the seminaries trained to meet such situations? They are not. Not only the clerical youngsters cannot meet them, but often after years of experience—we have found—the clerical oldsters cannot. And *that* is a serious charge against the ministry.

As to the problem of death, which the active minister meets constantly, one sees it in the general hospital. There life and death play touch-and-go. All of our students this summer had the experience of seeing patients who were facing death. Toward the end of the summer one of the students ministered to several patients who were dying. Others might have, had they been equal to it.

Not only do these situations that I have cited test religion as such, but they test him who represents religion. Our men go directly from the protecting walls of seminaries, and books, to meet these problems. And by what right? By what right does the minister go to the sick-room, or by what right is he expected to be able to lend courage to the sufferer, confidence to the dying? Has he suffered? Has he even seen any one suffer? Has he witnessed the fear of dying? Has he felt the *fear* of death turn to *confidence?* Has he worked shoulder to shoulder with those who have seen it, and are helping to bring it about?

Always, I ask myself when going to a sufferer, By what right am I here? By what right do I see you in the intimacies of your pain, your humility? By what right do I see the unfinished picture and the artist in his longing, the unfinished poem and the poet in his brooding? Yea, and even more! By what right do I dare hold up an ideal for you in your pain, or express your longings in prayer? *Only by the right of serving you.* If I may straighten your sheet, fix your pillow, quiet you by my presence, then I have a right to see you. If I may strengthen you by my

confidence, if I may encourage you by my patience, then I may come to you when you are ill. But how do I attain this knowledge of the sick-room, these qualities of the spirit? How do I know your sheets need to be straightened—often when you do not? How do I know, despite the fact a pitcher of ice water stands near-by, that you are to drink but small portions of it? How do I know you are restless because of boredom or moody because of fear? Only by having suffered myself, or by having served where I could observe. Only by proving my courage by my willingness. Only by working beside the experts, watching their skill and their manner. These are the things one sees in the general hospital, and these are the reasons for taking theological students to the general hospital for training.

Our students enter the hospital and work as orderlies; one of the occupations far down in the hierarchy of the institution. This summer they worked four and a half hours a day, for a period of a month. Here they had something to do for the patient: a definite service. Because there are certain things the orderlies must do, it is possible to give the men tasks so that they can be well into the routine of things the second day. During the other half day they attend seminars where methods for ministering to the sick and case material are presented. They also observe admission routine, visit clinics, observe operations, or see patients—with the theological supervisor.

During the last eight weeks of the period the students are assigned to definite sections or services within the hospital, where they see patients. There they observe any cases that may be called to their attention by the doctors, the nurses, social workers, or which they find themselves in talking with the patients. Each student prepares careful notes on his significant contacts, which are read by the supervisor. In this way every student is under close supervision, especially during his first contacts with patients. We have a plan whereby the student writes his notes on one-half of the page, while the theological supervisor writes notes on the corresponding half—similar to the medical day-sheet used in the hospital. There is thus a constant check of the student's work, both for the protection of the patient and for the help of the student. In his notes the student reproduces his interview with the patient. He notes especially his opening remarks and how he is received; what the patient said or did; giving attention to the order or chronology of any special remarks of the patient, in an effort to determine the patient's mental condition. The student's notes are closed with a summary in which he estimates his patient's mental and spiritual needs, how those needs can be met, the student's working relation with the patient, and what method he used. The theological super-

visor points out in his notes what seems to be significant points in the patient's story, or the student's method with him; and makes suggestions for follow up.

As a teaching set-up the hospital is hard to beat. We are dealing with vital material and the issues of life in actual situations. And we are working alongside scientific men whose constant regard for truth and efforts to bring relief to the suffering are the supreme things. One need not point out the general effect of such an experience upon one's whole ministry.

# BOOK REVIEWS

**The Ideals of East and West.** KENNETH SAUNDERS, LITT. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xxxiii, 246. $2.50.

KENNETH SAUNDERS is well known to students of Oriental culture and religion, more particularly for his contribution to the literature which deals with Buddhism, in which field he has won the rank of authority. The work under review, which modestly disclaims either completeness or originality, was undertaken at the suggestion of the Gaekwar of Baroda. The substance of it was delivered as the Earl Lectures before the Pacific School of Religion, and later at the University of London. The six chapters present brief anthologies of prose and verse, which unfold in chronological order the developing ideals of Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Greeks, Hebrews and Christians. The anthologies, however, are in each instance preceded by a brief account of the historical and cultural context of the system in question. While there are many critical questions underlying the assumptions which control both the exposition and the choice of passages to be included in the anthology, the work is, on the whole, objective and fairly balanced. A main question which would at once suggest itself to the professional reader is whether Buddhism should bulk so large in the account of India's ethic. But, by and large, the work should contribute to the end which the author had chiefly in mind, which was not so much to extend the bounds of scholarship as to popularize a series of ethical standards in the interest of a better mutual acquaintance of East and West. The imaginative Prologue—"An Evening in Ephesus"—presents a meeting and interchange of East and West in the city of Ephesus in the first century A. D. A similar Epilogue—"A Meeting of Chang-an"—presents a like interchange, in that ancient Chinese city, in the ninth century A. D. The work concludes with an index of principal teachers and an index of subjects.

HENRY B. ROBINS.

COLGATE-ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL.

**Arabia and the Bible.** JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, Professor of Hebrew and Aramaic in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 207. $2.00.

THIS volume of eight chapters, covering 207 pages, contains the substance of the Haskell Lectures, delivered in 1930 at Oberlin College. In well organized form it presents a survey of the relations between the Bible and Arabia, treating the most important phases of Arabian contacts and influences.

Among the conclusions are two that are of supreme importance to the student of the Bible. One is that the desert life and thought have penetrated much more of the Old Testament—and even the New—than is usually acknowledged. Primitive nomadic customs, the prohibition of wine, puritanic laws, were all born in the desert. Characters such as Elijah, Jephthah and John the Baptist, and the Nazarities and Rechabites, were more at home in the desert than in the cities of Palestine. Asceticism, rigid ethics and unitarianism were products of Arabia. None but the careful student of Arabia is aware how much our Old Testament is indebted to Arabia Deserta for both substance and spirit.

Another equally important conclusion, is that there was a peculiarly close relationship between the people of Southwest Arabia and those of Palestine. A detailed study of words with religious significance not only proves this affinity but throws very important light on some of the Old Testament customs and traditions.

The book, though packed full of facts, is easy reading, and should profit not only the student, but also the busy pastor who is eager to understand the origin and background of Old Testament customs and ideals.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

**Old Testament Life and Literature.** New Edition, Revised. I. G. MATTHEWS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xv, 358. $1.75.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS' book well deserves this "New Edition, Revised," as its publisher announces it. In a short space it capitally fulfils its purpose of presenting not merely an Old Testament history, but as its title sets forth, the story of the life and literature of Israel in the frame-work of history. The historical outlines are well sketched, and with sufficient reserve in cases where there is expert difference of opinion. Of great practical use is the chronological chart covering fifteen pages arranged in 5-6 columns. For each age we have in addition a résumé on the life of the people, the "culture," as the Germans say; e. g., the conditions and developments under David and Solomon are clearly expressed and wisely criticized. With the prophets there is still more room for the development of these historical features; the part that Isaiah and Jeremiah play in their times, and the historical illustration of their prophecies, or the utterances ascribed to them—is well done. An appropriate introductory chapter (III) is devoted to "Ancient Literary Methods," and throughout there runs a sober criticism of the sources, with the details of which his readers may not always agree, but for which always there is good authority. The several "Addenda" of the new edition (pp. 340-354) are very useful; I may remark the note to page 62, bearing upon the fresh discussion of the date of the fall of Jericho provoked by Garstang's recent excavations, and the note to page 227, treating the latest criticism of the Book of Ezekiel. The reviewer thinks that Doctor Matthews deals overcautiously with the question of the rise and spread of letters among the Hebrews (cf. pp. 14, 26f., 88, etc.), and that he does not give enough room for the possible early date of the stories in Judges and subsequent books; thus on page 64 he remarks that the tales in Judges are from J and E, which then he dates, as is customary, about 900 and 750 B. C. But the date of these compilations by no means determines that of the original stories, which, to my mind, may well go back in some cases in written form to the eleventh century. Is he not too cautious in saying (p. 26) that "we are on sure ground when we state that writing was practiced among the Hebrews about 1000 B. C."? His note to page 27 adds a brief account of the rudimentary alphabet found in Sinai while fuller notice might have been given to recent finds of very ancient Phœnician inscriptions and other written material from Syria. It is a pity that for the list of "Selected Books of Reference" there has not been a revision up to date. The English reader has in recent years been supplied with some important volumes; e. g., Olmstead, *History of Assyria,* and *History of Palestine and Syria;* Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel* and *Hebrew Religion;* Albright, *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible.* The reviewer hopes that this volume will have the attention of the intelligent reader and student who desires a clear, compact and very thoughtful study of the author's great subject.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

**An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament.** W. O. E. Oesterley, D. D., Litt. D. and Theodore H. Robinson, D. D., Litt. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. ix, 454. $4.00.

The authors have collaborated in a two-volume history of the Old Testament which in many ways is the most important volume of that type in English, up to date. This introduction, of over 450 pages, will take its place along side the former as a helpful study to the Old Testament. After a brief introduction on the canon and the text of the Old Testament, each book—the Pentateuch being treated as a whole—is presented in the order now found in the English Bible. In every case the history and conclusions of criticism are briefly summarized, the accepted date and authorship of the book presented, the contents analyzed, the message suggested and important features in the Hebrew and Septuagint texts mentioned.

Thus we have a convenient, simple and up-to-date manual that should form a safe guide for the busy preacher or Sunday school teacher who wishes easy access to the recent results of Bible study. A selected bibliography at the end of the volume adds to its value to the layman.

I. G. Matthews.

**A History of Religion.** Herbert H. Gowen, Professor of Oriental Studies, University of Washington. Milwaukee: The Morehouse Publishing Company. 1934. Pp. ix, 698. $3.50.

This is a worthy addition to the introductory works on the history of religions. Professor Gowen prefers to use the word in the singular since religion is, as John Dewey says, "a universal tendency of human nature." That, however, has not mitigated against his treatment of religions in their individual histories, which is requisite to a proper understanding of them. The author is within his rights in writing as a Christian, and announcing his faith in the superiority of Christianity. That is better than doing the same thing by implication. There is a rather unusual proportion of matters which concern the philosophy of religion for the size of the work. It is all important, but rather more than one expects in a work on history.

The reader welcomes the method of treatment of the primitive religions which is more specific and does not lump all primitive religions together as many authors have done. The treatment of the religions of antiquity and of Oriental religions is done with a fine sense of proportion and maintains the interest of the reader. The major part of the last three hundred pages is devoted to Judaism, Islam and Christianity. In the latter there is a conservative appraisal of the worth of developing doctrine, and an optimistic outlook for the present. One would like to find a more significant recognition of the relation of religion to the developing social life in its other aspects. Perhaps that is too much to expect of a work that is intended as a general outline. All in all this is a good book.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**Judaism.** A presentation of Its Essence and a Suggestion for Its Preservation. Rabbi Morris Lichtenstein, Leader and Founder of Jewish Science. New York: Jewish Science Publishing Co. 1934. Pp. 228.

This little volume is divided into three parts. The first is an interpretation of what is fundamental in Judaism. To the author what is essential is a relation of devotion between man and God and a just and humane relationship between man and his neighbor. This leads Rabbi Lichtenstein to a summary of the essential features of

the Scriptures, the God conception and ethics. This first section of the book that covers 132 pages presents as sympathetic and comprehensive a summary of the essentials in Judaism as can anywhere be found.

But theory is only a small part of the interest of the writer. How can the teachings be adequately applied to modern life, and by what methods can the end desired be attained, are of chief importance. Education is deemed the paramount agency by which Judaism may be instilled into the consciousness of the Jew. After a devastating criticism of the three types of schools that exist among American Jewry—in which only one-fourth of the Jewish children are enrolled—practical suggestions for adequate teaching are outlined. Six elements are stressed as necessary. The Jewish child should be taught: (1) The presence of God, His oneness, His goodness and His righteousness. (2) A religion that satisfies his own highest conceptions, and nothing that he will regard as fabulous or preposterous. (3) He must be taught to pray. (4) He must be taught as an integral part of religion, the highest ethics and virtues. (5) The Jewish language and (6) Jewish history, because of the values of racial inheritance should form part of his instruction. Thus by education, which embodies theology, religion, ethics, history and science, is there hope for the preservation of Judaism.

The book has very great value, not only for the American Jew, for whom it is written, but from it Christian educators can easily learn those things that are fundamental in the Bible of the Hebrews, and can take council from the practical suggestions as to ways and means to meet similar difficulties in our Christian churches.

I. G. Matthews.

**Chinese Ethical Ideals.** Rev. Frank Rawlinson. College of Chinese Studies, California College in China, Peiping, China. Pp. 128.

This little book is a compilation of a series of lectures delivered in Shanghai. The chief purpose back of the original lectures and the publication of this book is to answer some of the questions concerning the ethical ideals of the Chinese people which are, to a large extent, left unanswered by other writers on things Chinese. With this purpose in mind, the reader therefore should not seek in this book a comprehensive and systematic study of the Chinese ethical ideals.

Frankly, to write a comprehensive and systematic book on Chinese ethical ideals would not be an easy task. It would involve a thorough treatment of the whole historical development of Chinese thought. The main stream of this development centers around the Confucian system of thought. The philosophical ideas of Lao-tze constitute only a tributary influence, while the ethical ideals of Motzu (Micius), however modern and lofty we may think of them now, are practically negligible. Two more overwhelming influences come later, one from Buddhism, and the other from the ethical ideas of the West. The impact of these two tributary influences from outside have reshaped the direction and the content of the development of Chinese thought in general, and the development of Chinese ethical ideals in particular. After the introduction of Buddhism in China in the Han Dynasty (1st century A. D.), Buddhism caused a good deal of conflict with the more humanistic thought of the Chinese people, and aroused some bitter controversy among the Chinese literati. But in course of time, Buddhism became an indigenous religion, and its ideas of the life after death met one of the deepest needs of the Chinese people. Now, we have a new confrontation with Western

ethics which has already created a lot of confusion in the life and thought of the Chinese people. There are people today who advocate a total repudiation of the old Chinese ethical ideals, and say, "Let us follow the West!" There are also people who clamor for a restoration of the Chinese original ethical ideals, on the ground that there is a general degeneration of ethical life among Chinese people as a result of contact with Western culture. The Chinese are in a real state of confusion so far as their ethical life is concerned.

Doctor Rawlinson, being the editor of *The Chinese Recorder* and the *China Christian Year-Book,* is well versed in Chinese ethical and religious life and especially the clash and interaction between Chinese and Western ideals. He has certainly done a very valuable thing in interpreting to the West some of the basic Chinese ethical ideals with reference to Christian conceptions. The titles of the chapters will show what are some of the problems that he has dealt with. (1) Practical or Mystical? (2) Religion and Ethics. (3) Spirit and Matter. (4) Personality Values. (5) Wherein are Men Equal? (6) Ethical Values in Confucianism. (7) The Ethical Values in Micius. (8) The Supreme Good. (9) The Sense of Evil. (10) Ethical Striving and Immortality. (11) Ethical Factors in "Salvation." The author has attempted to incorporate ideas of both the intelligentsia and the masses. It is only natural if the reader will in some places find it a bit confusing and difficult to differentiate the main and tributary, the basic and superficial, the general and sectional influences in Chinese ethical life. And also in some places the reader may find the interpretations are a little too far-fetched and artificial, such as the treatment of the concept of "salvation." The author admits that he has tried to evaluate Chinese Ethical Ideals in terms of the Christian and his own experience, and is open to the frequently mentioned danger of reading too much into the minds of the Chinese thinkers.

W. H. Kiang.

**Education of Primitive People: A Presentation of the Folklore of the Bura Animists with a Meaningful Experience Curriculum.** Albert D. Helser, Ph. D., F. R. G. S. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. 316. $3.00.

This book is not one to be carelessly passed over by educational and missionary experts. The document comes directly out of the life experience of a man who has learned how to make Christianity a practical and natural ally to a primitive people. Far from imposing a foreign cult upon the Bura Animists of Nigeria, West Africa, Helser has infused the spirit and intent of our western religion into the very warp and woof of their own civilization. By critical observation he discovered in his missionary endeavor that folk-tale was the key that unlocked the meaning of the animists's life. He proceeded to collate their lore and found that it centered in four types of activities; home and social life, health, agriculture and livestock, and the crafts.

This range of tribal values suggested to the strategist a pattern for Christian education. He proceeded to form "a meaningful experience curriculum." That is, he began to lead out the people into the higher life of self-expression through furnishing deeper meanings and more scientific content to their folk interests. After a few introductory chapters which point to the philosophy of education the author espouses, he devotes the major portions to relating types of folk-lore and to "life-related projects with specific objectives." These latter are not just blue-prints on paper. They are the report of a work that is being well done through the channel

of school, hospital, farm and home. Verily it marks a new type of missionary endeavor and adds to the multiple forms that Christianity is taking in the world. There are highly important principles of procedure for religion in industrial and urban America in these creative pages. He tells us what education is essentially under any circumstances.

Doctor Helser has spent twelve years of his young life in Africa. He holds a doctor of philosophy degree from Teachers' College, Columbia University, and, because of his superior service to the Bura people, he has been honored with a fellowship in the Royal Geographical Society of Great Britain.

STEWART G. COLE.

**Makers of Christianity from Jesus to Charlemagne.** SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1934. Pp. xii, 255. $2.00.

DEAN CASE has long been recognized as the founder of a new school of church historians. He was the pioneer in the study of the history of Christianity from the view-point of the social order, the intellectual conceptions, the economic conditions and the political systems which formed the setting in which the people of any one age and section lived and which influenced them in their search for the higher life. We are indebted to him for making Christianity very real, a part of the life process of the people and not merely a system of doctrine, traditions and ecclesiastical practices.

In this, his latest book, Doctor Case has gone a little more into detail confining his study to those great leaders who have in the first eight centuries of our era helped to establish this form of religion called Christianity. Every age has witnessed a collapse of the older social order and required the establishment of a new. And in every such age there have been those prophets who have been able to interpret the experiences through which their people have been called to pass, to project in some measure a new order and thus lead to an adjustment of life, harmonious and progressive.

Such men were John the Baptist and Jesus in those first generations of Jewish submission to the Roman authority. Such also was Peter, and Paul more especially, as these Jewish folk were driven farther into the extensive territories and customs of that Roman world. Then came those who more firmly established the new order and were able, as Ignatius, Basilides, Justin and Irenæus, to coordinate some of the varying views and customs of the mingling civilizations and races. Later arose those stalwarts who were able to defend this newly founded system—such as Tertullian, Cyprian and Origen—and later still those who gave it State recognition and support, Constantine, Athanasius, Basil and Ambrose.

As that ancient State began to crumble and darkness seemed to be gathering over the world there were those raised up to hold high the torch of light and give men courage for despair, among them John Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. Pioneer statesmen of the new civilization of the West were Leo the Great, Benedict and Gregory the Great and leaders in building a new Imperial structure of State and Church were Gregory of Tours, Boniface and Charlemagne.

In popular fashion the achievements of these great "Builders" are recounted without in the least neglecting salient facts. Neither documentary sources, footnotes nor critical passages break the easy flowing of the narrative. The reader is made to see the human forces of the time—changing conditions, new developments, revolu-

tionizing customs and within it all leaders of thought who successfully attempt to Christianize the evolving culture.

This is history at its best—how it should be written and how it should be taught.

R. E. E. Harkness.

**Ancient Oriental History: New Light On the Old Testament.** Some factors Shaping Ancient Palestine. Allen Howard Godbey, A. M., Ph. D. Norman, Oklahoma: Lithotyped by University Litho Publishers. 1934. Pp. 127, and 7 maps. $3.50.

In this volume Doctor Godbey has organized the material and the results of a lifetime's study. In the preface, among others, are three very important assertions. The first is that the knowledge of the history of a people is essential to a knowledge of their religion. So important is this, and it is so generally neglected today, owing to the feverish rush of practical duties, that every way which aids in attaining the desired end is to be heartily commended. No person can go through this book without gaining a better understanding of the religion of Israel.

Equally significant is a second statement of Doctor Godbey's to the effect that pre-Israelite history is fundamental to an appreciation of significant elements in Palestinian life and thought. That is, one cannot adequately estimate the religion of the Hebrews without being familiar with the contributions made by the Ægean and Egyptian peoples in prehistoric times. It is becoming clearer every decade, that while the man of one Book may be a good man, in knowing his Bible, such an one can never be intelligent.

The third feature, we would note, is that no book on the Old Testament can long be up to date. The author takes his fling at the Bible Dictionaries, the best of which is more than twenty-five years old. Certainly in some respects it was out of date within five years of publication. Nothing emphasizes this fact more than this, that while Doctor Godbey's syllabus was issued in June, 1934, in not a few particulars it was quite out of date before it reached the reviewer. Such will be the case with any Palestinian publication, probably for the next twenty years. Hence the author is justified in proposing that this publication should annually be brought up to date.

The laboratory method is proposed by Doctor Godbey. Themes are suggested, ample and up-to-date bibliography is supplied and direction is usually given to the study. Cultural and ethnological prolegomena, Minoan-Philistine-Ægean influence in South Palestine, and Egyptian influences in Palestine, are the three main divisions of the volume. Any students of the Old Testament who carefully works through all this material will have much light thrown on many pages that otherwise might be very dark indeed.

I. G. Matthews.

**The Theology of Seder Eliahu: A Study in Organic Thinking.** Rabbi Max Kadushin, D. H. L. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. 1932. Pp. x, 221. $2.00.

*Seder Eliahu* is a collection of sayings purporting to have been revealed by Elijah, who will at various times have appeared on the earth and given revelations to his disciples. It is one of the collections of a considerable body of Midrashim, and because of its relation to the Mishnah and Talmud, is judged to have been written shortly before 500 A. D.

No one will question the author's statement that to attempt to find a coherent unity in Rabbinic theology is a hazardous task. Schechter, Moore and Kohler have made the venture, but with small success. Nor is there any doubt that the Rabbinic concepts differ in many ways from those inherent in the types of thinking with which we are familiar. Their methods of argumentation and the validity of their conclusions are not always convincing to the outside world. In view of this, the attempt to find a coherence in Rabbinic thinking is a worthy task.

Kadushin, in attempting this, first of all emphasizes the fact that Rabbinic theology was the result of "group thinking," which developed through long centuries, during which language, symbol and institutions were evolving and carrying forward ideas and ideals that were the complex product of Jewish group life. Thus their thinking was not individual, nor scientific, with its emphasis on continuous effort and logical consistency, but was the unpremeditated, responsive reaction of the group to their world milieu, and may justly be called "organic thinking."

The author next proceeded to classify every available statement in the *Seder Eliahu* in which there was a complete thought, omitting all fragmentary and corrupt texts. From this he concludes that there are four fundamental concepts, God's loving-kindness, absolute justice, Torah, and Israel, which he believes underlie the "organic thinking" of the Rabbis. These, in his opinion, are basal to all their thinking, and only in the light of these can all the statements of the *Seder Eliahu* be correctly understood. The work is extremely suggestive, and the author may be on the right track. Certainly, Rabbinic theology cannot be put in the categories of modern, Occidental theology.

I. G. Matthews.

**The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus.** Burton Scott Easton. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. 112. $2.25.

Hippolytus has long been a unique figure in Christian history. Because of his ultra-conservative, even cantankerous, attitude he was embroiled in many conflicts during his life, and was responsible for a schism in the Roman church. None the less he was honored both as saint and martyr. Confusion as to his bishopric was often expressed, but in spite of the vagueness of Eusebius and Jerome and the tradition that he was the bishop of Portus, it is highly probable that he was bishop of Rome. Furthermore, his intensely conservative nature makes his voluminous writings of great importance in revealing the views and practices not alone of his own day but in the previous decades. A partial list of these writings is preserved on his statue discovered in Rome in 1551. *The Refutation of All Heresies*—commonly called the *Philosophumena*—was early ascribed by mistake to Origen. Later investigation proved conclusively that it was actually the work of Hippolytus. This identification established also his authorship of other previously disputed works. The *Apostolic Tradition,* but one of a series of Church Orders or systematic manuals for discipline and worship, was first made known to the West in 1691 from the late Ethiopic version. Since that time several studies of it have been made, but no English translation of it has ever appeared nor any critical edition of the extant secondary and tertiary versions—the Greek is unfortunately not preserved—been attempted, although the need for both has been often expressed, for the writing is, as Harnack remarked, "the richest source that we possess in any form" for the earliest church polity.

This need Professor Easton has now met in his excellent little monograph. An able introduction which provides a convenient catalogue of the other Church Orders, a

brief but adequate review of the facts of Hippolytus' stormy career, and full critical notes greatly increase the value of his translation of the famous *Tradition,* which falls into four main parts—Ordination, Baptism, Church Laws, and Lay Devotions. It will prove of immense value.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**Mediæval Religion and Other Essays.** CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc.. 1934. Pp. 195. $2.00.

IN four Forwood Lectures delivered at Liverpool University, early in this present year, Mr. Dawson reveals that the Dark Ages were not so dark as history has usually presented them.

In the first, "The Sociological Foundations," he proves that in spite of the many changes and the breakdown of the social order with the barbarian invasion, those little societies we know as monasteries kept alive the ancient culture. "The Benedictine abbey was a little state which could serve as a model to the new Christian society which was arising from the fusion of conquered and conquering races, a state which had religion for its foundation, work restored to honour as its support, and a new intellectual and artistic culture as its crown."

In the second lecture, "The Theological Development," the author points out that though the saving grace for the West was a spiritual stream which flowed from the ancient East, nevertheless, the greatest influence of mediæval religion was "the evangelical piety and the devotion to the humanity of Jesus that found its supreme expression in the life of St. Francis of Assisi." "With him for the first time," according to Professor Dawson, "we see Christianity breaking through the barriers or race and social tradition and achieving an organic and complete expression in Western man."

In the following lectures, "Religion and Mediæval Science," and, "Religion and Mediæval Literature," beneath all the heavy soil of ignorance and superstition are discovered steady flowing streams of scientific research and literary achievements that have their sources in the "mixed culture of the Western Mediterranean." For it was through the Arabic channels of North Africa and Spain that the ancient Greek culture passed into western Europe revealing its own beauty on the background of Occidental poverty.

Thus by his profound erudition and his power to marshal and present a mass of facts clearly and concisely the author shows that the so-called Dark Ages are those in which Europe was grappling with the various elements which had so suddenly mingled within her borders, seeking to melt and fuse them into a common unity. The work is a striking proof that religion is not a mere intellectualism, nor a culture superimposed upon a people, but is always an integral part of their social life and can be understood only in the light of the total social order.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

**Immanuel Kant's Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone.** Translated with an Introduction and Notes by THEODORE M. GREENE and HOYT H. HUDSON, both of the faculty of Princeton University. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1934. Pp. lxxxv, 200. $3.00.

THE name of Immanuel Kant stands second to none in the history of philosophic thought. Many outstanding men have waited on him in the development of their

philosophical interpretations of religion. It is surely an anomaly that his own work on religion should be so little known in the English-speaking world. A translation published in Edinburgh in 1838 has long been out of print. Though it served a real purpose, the translation was inaccurate at many points. We are greatly indebted to Professors Greene and Hudson for giving us a new English version, worked out with great care and supplemented by notes and a fine introduction.

Students of Kant are familiar with his main argument, namely, that it is necessary to postulate God and immortality on ethical grounds. This is done so thoroughly that no thinker since Kant could neglect it. Many, however, have been unwilling to make such a sharp distinction between knowledge and faith as Kant did. Professor Greene rightly points out that Kant was using the word faith to distinguish man's moral intuitions from the sensuous. He did not deny cognitive significance to faith. Though Kant was exceedingly critical of religion based on reason alone, the fact remains that his own approach was rationally articulated, and his God more a product of the mind than the heart.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**A Common Faith.** John Dewey. New Haven. Yale University Press. 1934. Pp. 87. $1.50.

Much speculation has centered about the question of what John Dewey would say about religion, if he said anything. In his previous writing he has been strangely reticent about the subject. We have waited long for this pronouncement, and it must be said that it is thoroughly worthy of a great thinker. But it is not just what many predicted. Our non-theistic humanist friends have been looking to Dewey as something of a patron saint. This little book will probably disappoint some of them for it declares his faith in God.

The most significant phase of the argument is the fundamental distinction between the noun *religion* and the adjective *religious*. Dewey's point is well taken that the only possible definition of religion is to make it an abstraction denuded of all meaningful content because it has to cover so much. If we are going to use the noun, it had better be in the plural. But the adjective "religious" is applied to an attitude that can be taken toward every object and ideal, or to a quality of experience that issues in better adjustment to life and its conditions. This adjective signifies something that may belong to all types of activity in so far as they are pursued with reference to an ideal end.

When we turn to the content and object of faith we find Dewey critical of all those intellectual contents of faith which are associated with belief in the supernatural. He argues vigorously for the naturalness of the religious attitude, and shows effectively how the concept of the supernatural has been responsible for vagaries and differences. On the other hand, he is equally insistent on the recognition of the reality of ideals which have their roots in natural conditions. They are real because they exist in character, in personality and in action.

It is in connection with his discussion of ideals that Dewey introduces the concept of God. The theism of which he writes is not the traditional metaphysical type, and this is where the humanists find his support. That does not mean, however, that he has dispensed with the concept. Indeed it expresses his belief that it is necessary to convey the sense of an active relation between the ideal and the actual. It will be well to let Dewey speak for himself at this point:

"We are in the presence neither of ideals completely embodied in existence nor yet of ideals that are mere rootless ideals, fantasies, utopias. For there are forces in nature and in society that generate and support the ideals. They are further unified by the action that gives them coherence and solidity. It is this *active* relation between ideal and actual to which I would give the name 'God!'" (Pp. 50, 51.)

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**Lectures on the Meaning of God in Modern Life.** Scripps College Papers. Number Five. Claremont, Calif. 1933. Pp. 71.

Four lectures are included in these published papers. The first by Prof. John Whittier Dair deals with "The Meaning of God for the Average Man," and presents good homiletical matter. The second is concerned with "The Idea of God in Modern Politics," and is a discussion by Prof. Russell McCullock Story of the effects on political life of the God idea. In the third Prof. Theodore Gerald Soares treats "The Ethical Significance of the God Experience," a treatment rather of the significance of the experience of God in the moral consciousness of the individual than of its social implications.

It is the fourth lecture that demands our attention, as it is a contribution of major importance to our thinking about God, Prof. Hartley Alexander's lecture on "God and Philosophical Thinking." It is his idea that the reasons for believing in God do not call for explanation so much as the reasons advanced for disbelief. These are three: (1) the seeming inconsequence of man, (2) the fact that God is not seen or disclosed to man's senses, and (3) the inability to find God triumphant in the moral world. Professor Alexander faces these three grounds of denial, examines them, and sets forth positive grounds for dismissing them as fallacious. His positive philosophy is what commands our thought. It is in the drama of the world-action that we must seek for the meaning of reality. Much of our difficulty originates with a conception of God who is static.

The phenomenon of phototropism is significant. Plants and animals naturally turn to the light. "Visible light is the vestment of God as man perceives him outwardly, just as it is a metaphor of his inward revelation." There are evils—real evils—in the world. It is useless to deny their presence. Alexander, however, believes that God is realized in the turning from evil to good, from wrong to righteousness, from darkness to light, from selfishness to love. For God is inwardly more than a moral action. He is "love, and the object of love," as M. Bergson says: He is a God who struggles to make love the way of life, and insofar as we enter into this comradeship of love, we see God.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**The Sceptical Approach to Religion.** Paul Elmer More. Princeton, at the University Press. 1934. Pp. vii, 201. $2.00.

Professor More approaches the discussion of a sceptical approach to religion through Platonic idealism. There is no man living who is contributing better to the interpretation of Plato than he. Anything that he writes in that field is worthy of thoughtful attention. Plato, in some of his writings, made Socrates his mouthpiece for a scepticism in regard to intuitions or any data which claims to go behind the data of immediate experience. Yet it was Plato's conviction that it was only rational

to hold to a belief in God. His metaphysic was teleological, and his interpretation of the universe was that it sustained the struggle to morality and through morality to happiness. But the conclusions reached carried him beyond the potency of reason to go. There is nothing unreasonable in the conclusions. It is simply that there is a gulf between metaphysics and religion that can only be bridged by faith.

The sceptical approach when carried over to religion recognizes the limitations of reason alone, and also that there is a religious way of looking at facts as well as a scientific. The universality of the religious attitude is an arresting fact that the sceptic cannot dismiss lightly. There is fundamental unity behind the variations of religious belief. The sceptic by definition is one who keeps his mind open for new impressions and critically examines all claims to truth. His intellectual indecision may demonstrate the necessity of committing himself in faith to the religious attitude, as being more reasonable than any alternative. "Prometheus on his rock or the Lord Jesus on his cross, to hope or not to hope, these are the alternatives between which the sceptic sees that reason of herself is helpless to decide, yet between which he sees that he is bound to choose." So scepticism is the approach. Faith and hope are the ways of life chosen, and the Incarnation is the sublime content of that faith.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**Others Call It God.** A Unit on How the World Began. Jeanette E. Perkins, New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xx, 140. $1.50.

Would you think of introducing nine-year-olds in a church school to problems of cosmic evolution? Are not these abstruse questions to be reserved for academicians in seminars; or, at any rate, for college classrooms? Most of us would say so; but not this supervisor in the primary department of the Riverside Church School, New York City. She defends her departure in these words:

"Our children are hearing strange stories of origins, fascinating stories which are being made vivid by museum exhibits, by moving pictures of excavations of prehistoric life. One story fits into another until they have a better picture now of the world's beginnings and development than we who are older ever had, unless we have specialized in this study. But in all the stories, in school work or exhibit, God is left out of the process. Can we put him in without 'telling' the children he is there? To many of us the revelations of science only makes him more real, more wonderful, more necessary to the picture. Can children come to see him so?"

A chance question of a child in regular class started the author thinking and paved the way for this fourteen-week inquiry. The unit of work is described in a human and informative way. She does not assume that other teachers will follow her blue-prints. That is not the purpose of the book. Rather, she desires to show what third graders *can* do and the religious values that eventuate. The significance of the task lies in the understanding confidence that a teacher invests in religiously venturesome children and in the teaching technique that this confidence inspires. Concerning the latter, the frankness of the author would indicate that she learned as much about the art of teaching by means of this experience as the children learned about God's wonder-world. The reader of the book must fill up many gaps in the abbreviated material in order to appreciate the virtues of the course that the "visiting father" mentions in his splendid foreword.

Stewart G. Cole.

**That Strange Man Upon His Cross.** Richard Roberts. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 139. $1.25.

This is a heart-warming meditation on events in the life of Christ which led him inevitably to the cross. Yet it deals with "the irresistible splendor of personality revealed in that last hour of shame and anguish," rather than on anything he did. It is based on the conviction that Christ himself—what he was in his own inner self—is the very heart of Christianity. That self finds its highest, most sublime expression on Calvary.

This is not a theological treatise—not an attempt to show how the death of Christ saves us—not a discussion of the doctrine of the atonement. "It is an error to read a formal and systematic theology into the New Testament." Rather do we find there the story of new life enkindled by contact with a person. All the assurance of atonement that we need is found "in that divine moment on the cross." And having brought his disciples to such a point, "that strange man upon his cross claims us for his own and bids us follow him." A personal factor was predominantly with the first followers of Jesus. "They were captured, not by a program, but by a Person. They were held, not by a teacher, but by a Man. . . The experience of atonement was, as it were, a by-product of contact and union with the Person. They were drawn by the Person, and being drawn, they found atonement."

The conclusion of the matter is that what is required of us is that we make the cross the ground-plan of our lives.

Who is better qualified than Richard Roberts to lead us in a meditation on that strange Man upon his cross? This he has done in a book which gives the substance of lectures which he delivered at Yale University on the Kent Shaffer Memorial Foundation. It would be hard to find a more helpful volume on such a subject. Ministers who desire a book which will enrich their own lives and which will also enrich their preaching on the cross will do well to read this volume. Its authorship guarantees devotional treasure, and certainly the book has large homiletical values.

James H. Franklin.

**The Ethical Teaching of Paul: A Study in Origin.** Mary Edith Andrews, Assistant Professor of Religion, Goucher College. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 185. $2.00.

That Paul's most lasting contribution to Christian thought does not lie in the realm of theological speculation or definition but rather in the field of ethics has in recent years been recognized. Professor Andrews contributes a good book in this by no means overworked field. She attempts to make use of *Formgeschichte* and the "social-historical method best exemplified in the writings of Dean Shirley Jackson Case and other members of the group of scholars to which he belongs" "to bring Pauline *actions* abreast of Pauline *ideas*," or, as she elsewhere phrases it, to see Paul in "life situations."

The book is a good solid study and reaches sane conclusions. She stresses the fact that although Paul was a Jew, this heritage does not completely explain him. Many of Paul's slants, especially his "emotional approach," convince her that not only does Judaism fail to account for his ethical teaching, but that the Judaism from which he did turn was that of the Diaspora, and essentially different from Palestinian Judaism. With this last conclusion I find myself dissatisfied, especially since I

cannot see that the evidence she cites in support of this assumption actually bears out her contention. That Paul's mature thought in the epistles shows that he has gone a far step from the Palestinian synagogue is certain. This, however, is by no means an evidence that his original Judaism was of a looser or laxer kind. Twenty-five years of work among Gentiles, during which he had not only come to let down many bars which he had formerly felt essential, and the constant antagonism of his own race are not to be lightly overlooked. My most serious criticism would be that this was a "life situation" Professor Andrews should ponder a little longer.

The book is decidedly worth reading and while very brief and of necessity sketchy in spots is a distinct addition to a field that has received far less attention than it deserves.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**Beyond Damascus: A Biography of Paul the Tarsian.** F. A. SPENCER. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xiii, 466. $3.00.

HERE is an amazing book. It is possible to criticize it very severely and to say that it is not a biography of Paul at all, that much is read between the lines, and that the lines themselves are often drawn broadly. And the criticism would be a fair one, and one with which the author would probably agree. But it is far more than a biography of Paul. It is a splendid picture of the Mediterranean world (in which Paul and his contemporaries found themselves) at the dawn of the first century. When I first read the manuscript I was delighted to see the realization of a long-felt hope: a book that should essay in the light of modern knowledge of the ancient world what W. A. Becker's *Charicles* attempted more than half a century ago. And a fresh reading of the volume convinces me that this enthusiasm was not mistaken. Instead of the imaginary Charicles the apostle Paul is the figure chosen to enable the author to cast his description in the form of a narrative. A survey of the moral and social aspects of the ancient world which saw the birth of a new Oriental religion, vivid—but not too imaginative—portrayals of the mystery cults which were playing so important a part in the life of Asia Minor, Greece, and even staid and conservative Rome—these are among the chief values of this excellent book.

It is one that few if any New Testament specialists could have written. The hand of the expert classicist with an intimate and extended knowledge of the classical and neo-classical authors is evident on every page. And from these sources he has drawn illustrations and quotations with telling effect. He has included between the covers of one book much material which if available at all in modern dress would have to be searched for through many volumes. And it is written in a breezy—almost salty—style which captures the reader's interest on the first page and makes him very unwilling to lay the volume down unfinished. Not alone the professional scholar but the minister—and probably a good many laymen—will find that the volume opens up, or at least makes real, a new and highly important world.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**His Gifts and Promises.** JAMES MOFFATT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. vi, 245. $3.00.

THE distinguished author, who has occupied the chair of Church History at Union Theological Seminary for the past seven years, is so well known as a scholar through such works as his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* and

his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* that the reader may be surprised to find him equally at home in the field of devotional literature.

The book gets its title from Wordsworth's lines:

> "Why to God's goodness cannot we be true,
> And so, his gifts and promises between,
> Feed to the last on pleasures ever new?"

It is presented as "Twenty-five Reflections and Directions on Phases of Our Christian Discipline, from the Inside." The chapter headings are inviting, as a few selected at random will indicate: "A Gift Overlooked," "How God Handles Us," "Our Double Debt," "The Two Sides of Sympathy," "On Cares and Carefulness."

This is not a book to be glanced through hurriedly. Its beauties do not yield themselves fully at the first reading. Written by one whose mastery of language made possible the most read translation of the Scriptures into modern English, it carries out simply and reverently the author's purpose. From the depths of his own experience and the wide fields of his knowledge and culture, he brings to his readers treasures new and old. The noted scholar becomes the effective preacher.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

**Christianity Tested.** OSCAR MACMILLAN BUCK. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 257. $2.00.

HERE is another appraisal of Christian missions—a discerning, searching appraisal. But it is far more than that. It is a most stimulating and enlightening study of spiritual forces that are at work in the world. And it is offered by one whose antecedents, outlook, and deep personal interest make him a fraternal, although a critical and fearless, observer of Christian missions. Few men are so well qualified as Doctor Buck for such an appraisal.

No review of *Christianity Tested,* which must be limited to a few hundred words, will suffice to convey a fair impression of the value of the book. It opens many windows in many directions, and the views presented will lessen complacency regarding Christian missions. They would certainly produce pessimism if the author could not see spiritual forces at work in the world and did not believe in the ultimate triumph of the eternal Christ.

Doctor Buck makes it alarmingly clear that Christianity is being tested today, and in the realm of Christian missions in particular. Nationalism, fascism, communism, industrialism, and modern irreligion are giving Asia its ideas and its ideals, "while Christianity is being forced to the edges by a rush of these great movements of the day." Yet "the missionary enterprise has not awakened to the magnitude or significance of this change." . . "The needs of Asia will have to be seen in a new light by the missionary enterprise, if Asians are to cooperate with us, or to tolerate us in their lands." That is a part of the author's thesis, which his arguments fully justify.

The chapters on "Barriers" will be startling to those who are not awake to the difficulties that have been created by our ecclesiasticism, formal creeds, traditions, and attitudes. How often we have practically ignored the customs, ideas, and culture of Oriental peoples and have thought we were advancing the kingdom of heaven very largely by a reproduction in the Orient of our own practices, systems, and institutions. "The religions of the west—Judaism, Christianity, Islam—have

been as exclusive and intolerant of other faiths as the religions of southern and eastern Asia have been inclusive and tolerant of one another."

Doctor Buck is not satisfied to indicate barriers alone. He points out "A Road for the Christ in Asia." It would do a world of good if the Christian forces of America could read this book and give their mission boards freedom (encouragement also to such as may need it) to recast their plans and policies quickly with a view to helping the Christian forces of Asia make a new highway for Christ, while a similar effort is attempted in the West.

The book is all the more valuable because it "is really an autobiography in the rethinking of missions by one who was born into the older missions and brought up within them, who knew and loved and defended them, and then in two recent trips within a decade saw them inadequate to the new Asia which is shaping itself daily before our eyes."

JAMES H. FRANKLIN.

**Religion and Revolution.** ADOLPH KELLER, D. D., LL. D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1934. Pp. 188. $2.00.

THE persistence of tradition in the thinking and beliefs of a people and the inability even of scholars to free themselves of it is abundantly illustrated in this book which constitutes the L. P. Stone Lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1933. A crushing political defeat and social upheaval with consequent revolution against the intolerable order usually results only in a new interpretation of the ancient doctrines and creeds and a fanatical determination to enforce their acceptance.

Doctor Keller, than whom there is none better prepared or more able, interprets for us in these lectures the present revolution throughout all Europe and gives us insight into the soul of its peoples.

"The revolutions of the twentieth century," he says, "have emerged, consciously or unconsciously, from a religious background; they can hardly escape being considered religious problems . . . they are not mere political movements nor do they aim merely at the transformation of the social structure of mankind." They are profoundly great spiritual conflicts, veritable life and death struggles, thinks the author, "of secular religion against the Christian gospel . . . between the truth that comes from God and the truths that come from man."

Even in Russia (to the consideration of which a scant half-dozen pages are given) where the movement is avowedly anti-Christian, Bolshevism is nevertheless passionately religious. Nor is it so much a hostile "reaction against the former Russian Orthodox Church" as it is "a religion of science . . . a religion of idealism," in which "Salvation is seen in the collective social effort of mankind."

The major portion of the lectures deal with the situation in Germany and for this fact readers are doubtless grateful to Doctor Keller for it is in that great land and its present uncertainty their chief interest lies.

This German revolution, in all its phases and parties, is distinctly related to the Reformation and can be understood only as that movement of four hundred years ago is understood. "All the reformers, Luther as well as Zwingli and Calvin" emphasize "justification by faith" . . and "are in full agreement in their belief in the sovereignty of God's grace." But in the course of time these "truths" were lost and due to the influence of Cartesian philosophy and the theology of Schleiermacher together with the teaching of later religious leaders such as Ernst Troeltsch, man became central.

But the war changed all this for the people of central Europe. For "the war meant not only the defeat of an army. It was the defeat of a spirit; it dramatized the limit of man's possibilities." And thus there is a new search for the sovereign God of the Reformation. Karl Barth is the extremist who proclaims a God not only sovereign but unknowable save in his own direct revelation and much of the theological disputation of the time is simply a question of the relative completeness of this sovereignty.

Likewise the more nationalistic religious movements reach back into these doctrines of the Reformation. The "German Christians," though differing from Barth, begin with Luther's supreme God and his conception of the State as God's servant. So that the State becomes holy and in obedience to it salvation is found. "Those who oppose the State oppose God."

Even the National-Socialist (Nazi) party, which if not antichristian is unchristian, bases its arguments upon Luther. "He is the great *German,*" who is praised "not so much as a hero of faith, as a hero of the German nation." He it was who "discovered and understood the German soul." Thus the State to which obedience must be given (Romans 13) is the German State and a religion of "Blood" and "Nation" is founded thereon. For God has created these biological distinctions between races and between classes within them. "It is his will that the best blood should reign, that is, the Nordic, the Germanic race." Consequently, Hitler is doing the will of God in cleansing his nation of the "nuisance" and "dangerous poison" of Semitic foreign elements and establishing within it a pure Aryan life-force.

It was the "German Christians" who, early in the year 1933, upon the ascension of Adolf Hitler to power, successfully demanded the formation of a Reichskirche and had Chaplain Mueller, a close friend of Hitler's, appointed Reichsbishop. Immediately the proclamation was issued that "the new united church would stand firmly on the material principle of the Reformation, 'justification by faith alone.'" But it was equally as emphatically stated that "Equality before God, however, does not exclude inequality before men, for the law of inequality is also founded upon God's creative will," referring to the opposition to the Jews. Moreover, this church, though not a state church, "assumes full responsibility towards the State and is willing to collaborate in the building up of a new nation." And the Reichsbishop has publicly "thanked heaven for the appearance of a leader in a time when the enemies of the Cross of Christ were preparing to destroy the people both inwardly and outwardly." And though he has declared that "the State cannot be ruler of the Church" he nevertheless asserts that "it is none the less a gift of God which we must recognize."

Such is the present situation in Germany though there are many groups who are strongly opposed to the new organization of the Reichskirche, demanding religious liberty and an evangelical gospel.

But there seems to be no recognition on the part of any religious leader of the weakness and failure of the Reformation, nor any tendency to go beyond it. Yet it is the doctrines of the Reformation which has put Germany in the pitiable condition in which she finds herself today. Luther's literal and dogmatic interpretation of the Bible, which caused him trouble continually, has cursed his country unto this present day in this exaltation of the State. Germany still worships the tribal leader and scorns the lowly man as serf. The history of Anabaptism is its proof. The human note of Jesus' message has never yet been heard in the land. Jesus of Nazareth is not the brother but "the heroic fighter." God is not the Father of men but the Lord of the Nation, the great Nordic Creator.

R. E. E. Harkness.

**Radio Talks On Religion.** God and the World Through Christian Eyes. LEONARD HODGSON, Editor. Milwaukee, Wis.: Morehouse Publishing Co. 1934. Pp. 165. $1.75.

THIS little book is the publication of talks on religion delivered by twelve ministers and professors on alternate Sunday evenings throughout the year 1933, through the British Broadcasting Corporation. It constitutes the second series or the second volume of such radio messages to be put into print. The first volume presented "the Christian faith in God, and show the part played in that faith by the revelation of God in Christ." These present lectures "exhibit the relevance of that faith to the world of today. The first six describe different aspects of this world, the last six present Christianity as a way of life based on the Christian faith and lived in the circumstances of the present age."

It may be said at once that these talks are British, from the British standpoint and, naturally, concerned largely with British interests. But, moreover, they are definitely colored by the doctrinal and theological positions of the established church. This is only to be expected. Nevertheless, with this recognition it must be said that they form a very worthy effort to interpret Christianity and practical Christian ethics in the light of present-day needs and intellectual concepts. How thorough and comprehensive is that attempt may be gathered from such subjects discussed as these: Man and Morality; Man and Civilization; Man and Social Order. The Christian and His Neighbor; The Christian as National and International; Christianity and Other Religions.

Nor are these subjects dealt with in a mere superficial manner. Necessarily they are briefly treated. In "Man and Civilization," Christopher Dawson shows how easily those social orders which owe their origins to Christian principles may in time become harmful to mankind rather than a blessing. Nationalism with its high spiritual conception of unity and sacrifice for the common good may become a narrow racial hatred. Democracy with its lofty idealism of human rights and worth may become class prejudice and abusive demagogism. And Evelyn Wrench in "The Christian as National and International" appeals for a world loyalty as well as that to the home, community and Commonwealth of Nations. There might well be a United States of the World and Armistice Day of the nations.

These talks, of course, might not make a strong appeal to an American audience. It is, indeed, a question whether similar talks would be popular over an American broadcasting system. But they show what can be done. And it might be worth trying.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

**The Reason for Living.** ROBERT RUSSELL WICKS. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. xxiii, 306. $2.00.

THE Dean of the Chapel at Princeton University has given us a volume which will serve as a guide to the perplexed and which is a boon to pastors, parents and teachers in their efforts to help youth in this confusing age. Here are the "issues of life," plainly presented and frankly considered. The author states, however, that he is "seeking to furnish, not some complete and logically arranged scheme of thought, but rather the raw material out of which convictions can be formed."

The first part of the book "gathers together the material which goes into the making of the faith we live by." Possible reasons for living, the working system of creation, spiritual influences affecting personality, superhuman concern for indi-

viduals, unconscious faith, the personality of God, the nature of the Bible and the authority of Christ are given consideration.

The second part is devoted to "the problems which this faith confronts in daily life." Some of these are individual such as finding the right life, overcoming helplessness, redirecting desires, meeting adversity, and taking time to keep alive; others are social and have to do with the experiences of the individual in a "commercialized world," and his adjustment to an "interdependent" one.

The table of contents is especially useful. In addition to the chapter headings, the subpoints are indicated and paged. Under these subpoints the questions upon which the discussions are based are given. There are upwards of two hundred of these, typical of the many asked by thousands of college students over a period of ten years. The answers, tested and reshaped through private conversations and public addresses, give in a vital and convincing way the author's idea of *The Reasons for Living.*

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

**You Can Master Life.** JAMES GORDON GILKEY. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. viii, 186. $1.75.

THIS new book by Doctor Gilkey will receive a royal welcome from those who have read any of the seven which preceded it. The author declares that "The major difference between people is that some succeed in mastering life, while others permit life to master them," and goes on to show that the personal problems of every-day life are not beyond solution. Wisdom, strength, incentive and endurance are within reach of all, making it possible for them to "master life."

The titles of a few of the ten chapters will indicate some of the important problems considered: "Breaking the Grip of Worry," "The Secret of Getting a Lot Done," "Learning to Adjust," "Gaining Courage to Endure." In each case the difficulty is presented clearly, and definite suggestions made as to meeting it.

Helpful illustrations, pointed poems, and convincing arguments make every chapter of the book inspiring. The reader is challenged to take himself in hand once more, face each unsolved problem and say "I can do it and I will."

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

**Children of the New Day.** KATHARINE GLOVER and EVELYN DEWEY. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. Pp. ix, 332. $2.25.

WHO is "a happy, socially adjusted adult in the civilization of today"? He is "one whose behavior has successfully carried him through childhood and adolescence, from the pretense of life of the little child to an independence of coddling, to an independence in controlling his emotions and to the ability to be considerate of people's opinions. His behavior shows him to be one who has attained self-support, a heterosexual attitude, and a philosophy of life which are to stand him in good stead as he engages in the trials of maturity and old age."

This standard of adult achievement represents the sober thought of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection; a conference of America's leading doctors, social workers and educators, convened in 1930 at the call of President Hoover. They had made extensive surveys of all phases of child life and brought together the most important and comprehensive studies of youthful personality that have ever been collected. Some in rather technical form, others in

more readable style, these materials are being published and widely disseminated. This book is one of fifteen such studies. The authors, drawing freely from White House Conference findings, have furnished the reader a life-size portrait of Uncle Sam's child. He is seen amid the baffling conditions that earmark our times as one who can, by the grace of hygienic breeding, achieve his physical, social and spiritual maturity.

No friend of youth can read these pages thoughtfully and remain morally indifferent to the new learning. Not only are we finding out how glands regulate growth, favorable habits may be stimulated and the emotional phase of personality become increasingly qualified, but we are accounting for the acute conflicts within boys and girls with their determinative and often damaging consequences in character formation that are increasingly commonplace in our time. We are in a position to counsel with youth more advisedly and withal, live with them more intelligently. Child-guidance in home, school and community is approaching a conscious vocation. Nor is this a faddish trend due to hypersensitiveness to the new harvests of child information that friends of youth are reaping from the fields of science. Social forces in the community have changed more in the past fifty years than in centuries before; they are still in process of rapid change. These are producing strange facts of youthful personality, often disastrous, compelling the leader of the younger generation to keep his knowledge abreast of the drifting age. Herein lies the distinctive contribution of this book: it presents the child as the personal epitome of the forces of our civilization and expresses the faith that he can reach maturity in his own way and with commanding credit. The "new day" is at hand and a new child is in the making to meet it.

STEWART G. COLE.

**Modern Man's Worship.** BERNARD EUGENE MELAND. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xix, 317. $2.50.

OUR author is Professor of Religion and Philosophy in Central College, Fayette, Mo. He gives us a volume worthy of a place on that lengthening shelf of present-day books which have a message for modern man in his quest for reality in worship, both private and public. Limited space not permitting a review does, however, allow a presentation of the table of contents: Part I, "The Renascence of Religion," with seven chapters—New Perspectives; The Recovery of Worship in America; The Trends of Liturgy among German Protestants; Rudolph Otto and the New Church Worship in Germany; Frederick Heiler and the Lutheran High Church Movement; Contemporary Religious Movements in France, and Religious Awakening in Modern Catholicism. Part II, "Toward Reality," with eight chapters—Recovering Awareness of Reality; At Home in the Universe; Man, and Earth Creature; Two Approaches to Reality; God as Sustaining Process; The Nature of Religion; The Religious Man's Response; and The Sense of Wonder. Part III, "Reality in Life," with eight chapters—Modern Man's Need of Worship; Personal Adjustment through Worship; Some Fundamental Attitudes; The Appreciative View of Life; Objective Experience through Art and Literature; The Two Sides of Life; Mysticism and Conduct; and Toward a Philosophy of Life.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

**Church Unity Movements in the United States.** H. Paul Douglas. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research. 1934. Pp. xxxviii, 576. $3.00.

This is the July selection of the Religious Book Club, and constitutes a thorough study of the entire Church unity movement of our time. It is therefore an invaluable book of reference. Its three parts give a hint of the scope of this research volume: Objective Trends and Popular Reactions; Ecclesiastical Thinking and Proposals; Prospects of Church Union. The book should surely be placed in every public and institutional library, and should of course be close at hand for every minister who can afford it.

William R. McNutt.

**New Frontiers.** Henry A. Wallace. New York: Reynal and Hitchock, Inc. 1934. Pp. vi, 314. $2.00.

The Secretary of Agriculture is one of the most commanding figures in the President's cabinet. He combines gifts of scientific acumen, rare insight and a passion for economic, social well-being. In addition he possesses a facile pen. He is conscious that there is taking place in America today a silent revolution. We are entering a new world of thought and communal living. The present volume describes the frontiers of that world in a very effective way. He describes it in terms of the economic planning that is characterizing his own department as well as other departments of government, and expresses the hope that we are beginning to construct social machinery that will carry out the Sermon on the Mount.

Democracy is on trial in America. Its supreme test is the ability to deal intelligently with rapidly changing conditions. It must take advantage of the accumulated values of our receding individualistic pioneering period, and at the same time function in the new world where traditions are being dissolved and a social conscience is emerging. The important thing is not any particular plan, but a willingness to adjust any plan to human welfare in the changing conditions. Accordingly Mr. Wallace offers no brief for the National Recovery Act and admits that the Agricultural Adjustment Act is an experiment. One cannot read the book without being convinced that it is an experiment made in honesty and good faith. *New Frontiers* is a book for the American public, and deserves to be read.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

**Must the Nation Plan?** A Discussion of Government Programs. Benson Y. Landis. With a Foreword by Charles A. Beard. New York: Association Press. 1934. Pp. 221. $2.00.

The rather full title of this book, the well-known place of the author in the field which he discusses, and the fact that Charles A. Beard was willing to write for the work a four-page introductory Foreword—all these together at once indicate the probability, if not the certainty, that here are pages to be taken into account seriously as present conditions in the United States are under review. Doctor Beard makes this still more certain as he says: "This volume by Mr. Landis is not directed to men and women who have shut their minds—not to men of the sword, right and left, or to the large body of respectable citizens who seem to believe that history has been finished by the Constitution of the United States as they interpret it. It is directed to the portion of the American public which adheres to the *method* of the party that made the Constitution—the method of proposal, appeal, discussion, and resolution, followed by actions directed against the crisis in hand. Mr. Landis faces

the crisis, provides materials which contribute to an 'understanding' of it, and adds apparatus for further guidance and debate."

That quotation is sufficient to show the direction which the pages of Doctor Landis take, in which he treats the various programs which have been proposed, makes interpretation of them, raises important questions concerning the treatment of consumers, the relation of present problems to the Constitution, the value of experimentation, etc. The book closes with suggestions for continuing discussion of the problems involved. One does not need to urge that here are stimulating pages for open minds.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

**The Synoptic Gospels.** JAMES HARDY ROPES. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1934. Pp. 117.

THE death of Professor Ropes saddened all those who had had the privilege of knowing him. He was a scholar of the finest type, a gentleman of rare culture and charm. His work on the *Text of Acts* has been widely acclaimed as a standard of what such a piece of work should be. Several other volumes, including *Die Sprüche Jesu die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht überliefert sind,* the volume on James in the *International Critical Commentary, The Apostolic Age,* and *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians* are all models of careful and accurate scholarship. Always abreast of modern scholarship and cordial to new and revolutionary ideas, he exhibited a poise and balance that prevented him from being stampeded or carried away to the one side or the other. Whenever he spoke or wrote, his words carried weight.

Professor Ropes had hoped to raise afresh the question of the dependence of Luke upon Matthew, feeling as he did that the denial of this point was by no means so justified as was universally believed. His death prevented him from realizing that hope. In these four lectures he has not attempted that task, but has shown that it was still in his mind.

Too often the Synoptic Gospels are read and studied as if they had been intended by the authors to stand side by side in parallel columns. To approach them in such a manner is to lose their individual character and much of their value. Each has its own distinct nature and purpose. Mark is not a biography in any sense of the word, nor was its purpose specificially historical. It is a highly dramatic sketch or treatise attempting to answer the question: Why did the Messiah die? How could Jesus' career end in contumely and in a criminal's death? All else is incidental. Thus, although in narrative form, it is definitely theological in character. Jesus was the Messiah, knew himself as such from the start of the ministry, and died because of his claim. Then the author contents himself with showing what the cause of the opposition was and that Jesus' death, far from being a sign of his defeat, had been divinely appointed.

Matthew is quite different. It also is no biography. Rather it is a systematic compendium or handbook of the deeds and words of the Founder of the Christian church. Although less vivid than Mark it was better adapted than its predecessor to supply the need of an organized church life because of its masterly arrangement and the inclusion of many of Jesus' sayings. The author was obviously not the apostle Matthew. His free use of the non-apostolic Mark is sufficient to prove that.

Luke, on the contrary, is a biography, and the first volume of a history of which the second volume is the book of Acts. Although its author was probably

the companion of Paul, the book was not written until the last quarter of the first century. In addition to Mark the author properly makes use of Matthew. Thus the hypothesis of Q—the hypothetical second or discourse source from which Matthew and Luke are usually believed to have drawn independently—is pure inference and not improbably imagination. Unlike Matthew, who was surely a Jew, Luke was a Gentile although probably on the fringe of Judaism.

In the last lecture Professor Ropes raised among other questions that of translation. Here too he expresses views which he had long held and which chance to touch a problem once more hotly debated—the question of an Aramaic original. Although he expresses himself very cautiously—this is a characteristic of Professor Ropes, not of Aramaists in general—he shows himself not unfriendly to the view that Mark, and perhaps Matthew too, may be a translation from a written Aramaic gospel. Such a view for Luke is quite impossible, although the first half of Acts may perhaps be regarded as a translation.

But the charm of the present volume is independent of these questions. In each of the lectures the Gospels glow with a new life. One feels as he lays down the book a fresh desire to reread the Gospels. And to arouse this desire was Professor Ropes' aim.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**A Neglected Predicate in New Testament Criticism.** H. E. DANA. Chicago: Blessing Book Stores, Inc. 1934. Pp. 50.

HERE the author deals with the canonization of the New Testament and approaches the subject from what he considers the view-point of a neglected predicate, namely, "the psychological basis of canonicity." That is, there must have been reason why a document was circulated and finally found a place in the canon. He attempts to solve the problems of the writings by trying to see the people to whom they were written, in their environment and to determine their attitude towards the documents. For example, in studying the Corinthian problem he says, "The application of our predicate here is to suggest that the unsettled conditions of the church at Corinth had something to do with the peculiarity in structure which cannot escape notice in these epistles."

This seems to be a most wholesome approach to the question of New Testament criticism, because our orthodox views and modern theories of criticism all arose many years after the writings. Those orthodox views may prove to be of no value after all. Therefore, it is necessary to make use of all possible information concerning the conditions and attitudes of the early churches and peoples.

This little book gives some helpful information concerning the canonicity of the New Testament. However, the author seems too positive in his conclusions. It is delightful reading and should inspire any New Testament student to further study.

JOHN R. LINK.

**The Practice of Public Prayer.** J. HILLIS MILLER, Dean of Students, Bucknell University. New York: Columbia University Press. 1934. Pp. xvi, 198. $2.50.

DEAN MILLER confines himself to his subject. He is not concerned with theories of origin and nature of prayer, except to give summary statement of the conclusions of Söderblom, Heiler, Van der Leeuw, Moris Puglisi, and others, in order to show how theories and practice interact. The Dean's discussion is timely and important, since prayer is an integral part of public liturgical worship, and has so large a

share in determining sentiment and conduct. At least theoretically it has such designs. The author "concentrates upon the various forms, content, and emotions which constitute the public practice of prayer."

In the second chapter, "Petition in Public Prayer," he has compared the content of the liturgies of the Orthodox Jew, Reformed Jew, Catholic, Anglican, and non-liturgical Protestant, and classifies in parallel columns the objects prayed for. Since the author was formerly associated with Doctor Fosdick at the Riverside Church, he has taken the latter's prayers as typical of non-liturgical Protestants. The result is an interesting illustration of how public prayer by the leader of worship is a reflection of the actual or ideal public conscience. He also indicates the need of flexibility in liturgical prayers in order to meet the demands of a conscience made increasingly sensitive to social evils by Christian preaching.

The volume has an introduction by Doctor Fosdick, and an excellent bibliography. It is well indexed. Doctor Miller has written a book that will well repay reading by every pastor and other leaders of public worship.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**The Cambridge Shorter History of India.** Edited by H. H. DODWELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xix, 970. $4.00.

THE published volumes of the *Cambridge History of India* are indispensable to any student of history. A briefer history embodying the researches represented in the more extensive work were desirable. Such a shorter work should not be merely a condensation by omitting materials, but a restatement of the main issues in proper perspective and interpretation in the light of the mass of materials not cited in "Shorter History," but known to its contributors. In spite of length of time covered, and the mass of materials to be considered, and the importance of so many relatively minor incidents necessarily omitted, the editor has produced a volume, not only encyclopedic in information, but readable and interesting.

The volume has three parts, each written by an expert in his own field. The first part, entitled "Hindu and British India" has been written by J. Allan, Keeper of the Coin Department of the British Museum; the second part, "Muslim India," by Sir T. Wolseley Haig, editor of the *Cambridge History of India,* volumes III and IV; the third part, "British India," by Professor H. H. Dodwell, editor of the *Cambridge History of India,* volumes V and VI.

The longer history is not yet completed, but this "Shorter History" covers the whole field from the Vedic period until the present, with sufficient detail and comprehensiveness. It should be available to every person who desires an understanding of the present-day situation in India both politically and religiously. The day has come when a knowledge of the Oriental cultures of India and China is as important for the citizen of tomorrow as the knowledge of the history of Greece and Rome has been for the educated man of today. The entrance of England into India has been as revolutionary for Oriental culture as the conquest of Alexander and the domination by Rome combined affected the Mediterranean Basin and subsequently Europe.

Professor Dodwell and the Macmillan Company have rendered invaluable service in making this history possible at relatively small cost. It should find a place in every public library however limited its financial resources.

MILTON G. EVANS.

# BOOK NOTICES

**The Baptist People: From the First to the Twentieth Century.** P. E. Burroughs. 1934. Pp. 105. 60 cents.

**How to Win to Christ.** P. E. Burroughs. 1934. Pp. 105. 60 cents.

**Old Testament Studies.** P. E. Burroughs. 1934. Pp. 117. 60 cents.

**Some Learning Processes.** John L. Hill. 1934. Pp. 115. 60 cents.

**When Do Teachers Teach?** H. Clay Trumbull and Doak S. Campbell. 1934. Pp. 100. 60 cents.

**The Book We Teach.** J. B. Weatherspoon. 1934. Pp. 133. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

**From Joshua to David.** John L. Hill. 1934. Pp. 87. Cloth, 60 cts.; paper, 40 cts.

**From Bethlehem to Olivet.** Hight C. Moore. 1934. Pp. 99. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

**Looking at Learning.** J. L. Corzine. 1934. Pp. 126. Cloth, 60 cts.; paper, 40 cts.

**From Pentecost to Patmos.** Hight C. Moore. 1934. Pp. 132. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

**The Grace of Giving.** P. E. Burroughs. 1934. Pp. 125. Cloth, 60 cts.; paper, 40 cts.

**The School in Which We Teach.** G. S. Dobbins. 1934. Pp. 144. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

**Personal Factors in Character Building.** J. M. Price. 1934. Pp. 133. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

**From Adam to Moses.** Harold W. Tribble. Nashville, Tenn.: Baptist Sunday School Board. 1934. Pp. 135. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

The preceding fourteen books are published by the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn.

Attention should be called to these books, and they should be mentioned together because of relationships which appear in the titles, etc., as given above, and also for the fact that other volumes of similar sort are a part of the plan of publication. As one examines the books he becomes aware that the Southern Baptist Convention proposes to cover the general field of religious education in its own way and with such material as to hold the religious interest of its teachers and young people within the field of its own interests as fully as possible. This appears considerably in the first of the above volumes, which, for one thing, passes over far too easily some important points in Christian history as related to Baptist development. A similar treatment of biblical materials is observable in the volume concerning the Old Testament, and, in a different way of course, in the other books. Southern Baptists in general are unfortunate in having placed before them volumes which, attractive and in popular style, do not present more suitably the best available treatment of the materials involved.

Frank Grant Lewis.

**At the Gate of Asia.** Foy Johnson Farmer. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1934. Pp. 120. 40 cents.

This is an informing little book on the work of Southern Baptist Missionaries in Japan, written to be used in study classes, and well adapted to that purpose.

**Kingdom Come.** HUGH REDWOOD. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1934. Pp. 128. $1.00.

INTEREST in this book arises largely from the experience of the author and the relation of these pages to earlier works from his pen. He had previously written a book with the title *God in the Shadows,* to which the present volume is related somewhat as a sequel. From his pen have come other volumes of somewhat similar content, one of these dealing with religious conditions in the slums of London. As an outcome of his experience and his writings he was appointed religious editor of the London *News-Chronicle.* Altogether, he is said to have become "the most widely-read lay evangelist writing in England today, and the sales of his books, in their English editions alone, exceed 600,000."

From such a background Mr. Redwood, in the volume before us, presents a series of homiletic interpretations of the Lord's Prayer, giving a brief chapter to each of the ten phrases of the Prayer as he divides it. Accordingly, the book offers, in racy style, the practical meaning which Mr. Redwood sees in the model prayer which Jesus left for his disciples, and in these pages of Mr. Redwood's the reader of today may find much of stimulating suggestions for Christian living. R. N.

**Racial Contacts and Social Research.** (Vol. XXVIII, American Sociological Society.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 129. $1.50.

THIS book includes sixteen papers and the abstracts of forty papers presented at the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, held in Philadelphia, Pa., December, 1933. Under the general theme of race and culture contacts a wide range of research subjects is treated. They represent the professional interests of teachers of religion, anthropology, psychology, and sociology in various higher schools of learning on the continent. There are six abridged studies in the section on the sociology of religion.

**Elemental Religion.** L. P. JACKS. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 143. $1.75.

THE sermons in this volume are not ordinary. They created quite a furore in England. Preaching that can bestir an Archbishop's Court must be unusual. But when one reads the sermons he is surprised to find that they are not heretical. They breathe the spirit of the courage of Jesus, and are full of wisdom and grace. One would like to quote some passages, but how to choose is difficult. Especially would the reviewer commend the chapters on "The Preacher's Difficulties" and "The Rising Generation."

**God's Turn.** HENRY SLOANE COFFIN. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 100. $1.00.

IF one were to express an opinion as to the peculiar quality of Doctor Coffin's sermons which attracts the reader, one would have to say, they are interesting. To make the truth of God interesting is no mean art. It is at its best in this volume. These are "meaty" sermons—and full of real religion. The titles are attractive, but never deceptive. This is a fine study volume for homiletes who would find great preaching.

**Vitalism and Mechanism.** (A Discussion.) HERBERT V. NEAL, Ph. D., Sc. D., Professor of Zoology in Tufts College, and JAMES M. FOSTER. Published by the authors. 1934. Pp. 87.

HERE is an interesting and informing selection from the correspondence of a college professor, and a former schoolmate, who is now in business. While the discussion

is far from exhaustive, it does bring out the fundamental problem involved—how can new properties or qualities such as life, mind, value, etc., arise, if to begin with there is only matter or energy. In a friendly spirit the element of truth in both views becomes apparent. At the same time one is conscious of inevitable prejudice, even among those who attempt honestly the scientific attitude. Thus it seems that mere appeal to facts as such may turn out to be no more effective than the proof-text method in Scripture. It is a fine example of a worth-while correspondence.

**Let's Build a New World.** BURRIS JENKINS. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 96. $1.00.

**Suburban Christians.** ROY L. SMITH. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1933. Pp. 108. $1.00.

**Can I Know God?** FREDERICK B. FISHER. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 140. $1.00.

**The Return of Spring to Man's Soul.** IVAN LEE HOLT. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 119. $1.00.

**Like a Trumpet.** CHARLES E. JEFFERSON. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 125. $1.00.

**The Gods of Men.** OSWALD W. S. MCCALL. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 118. $1.00.

**Sermons for Everyday Living.** ALBERT W. BEAVEN. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1933. Pp. 138. $1.00.

THESE seven books published by Harper and Brothers and The Judson Press give us a library of present-day preaching far above the average of what we ordinarily hear. The authors of these sermons are well known in their respective spheres and are gladly heard by thousands. The sermons are timely, searching and profitable, and furnish a good field for modern homiletic research.

**Lay Leadership in Protestant Churches.** LEO VAUGHN BARKER. New York: The Association Press. 1934. Pp. 240. $2.50.

THE book before us sets out to make an objective, scientific study of leadership qualities and how to produce these. A thousand and one lay leaders in eighty-two churches were studied on the basis of questionnaires which they filled in. The study results in a vindication of "training" for leadership and a vital relationship between adolescent activity and later usefulness. In other words, training must begin early —a lot of study and investigation to vindicate what has long been our working hypothesis.

W. R. M.

**A Pilgrimage of Ideas; or, The Re-Education of Sherwood Eddy.** SHERWOOD EDDY. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1934. Pp. 336. $2.50.

SHERWOOD EDDY, a child of self-complacent, self-righteous, fundamentalist America, rebels. For many a day he has been a rebel, even from college days when the stern and ugly facts of the glorified *status quo* stabbed him wide awake and compelled him to think. From college and seminary, through a notable missionary service in India, and then the World War and the fateful aftermath—all through the years he has been a fearless pilgrim seeking light and truth. In this volume he tells the story; an interesting and arresting story it is.

W. R. M.

**Today's Jesus.** Carl Wallace Petty. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1934. Pp. 200. $1.00.

Our American Baptist world was shocked in September, 1932, by the untimely death of Dr. C. Wallace Petty, then in the prime of life and in the midst of a great ministry. Here is a collection of ten of his sermons. They breathe the vigor of his mind and the ardor of his great soul. All of us are grateful to his loved ones for sharing with us this treasure volume.

W. R. M.

**Taking a City.** Douglas Horton. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. v, 116. $1.00.

In this collection of sermons Harpers continues the fine service which it is rendering to sermon-lovers. Doctor Horton's style is varied and refreshing, reminding one at times of Studdert Kennedy. In *Taking a City* surprise attacks and even guerrilla warfare is employed. For instance, folks may die from heart failure, but not from sleeping sickness when a preacher touches up the Scripture so that it reads, "And they came unto a place called 'The Skull'; there they crucified him. And Jesus said, 'Damn these men; I'll get them yet.'" But it isn't all guerrilla warfare by a long shot. He brings up his heavy howitzers, lays siege, and demolishes the wall of prejudice and bigotry which surrounds many a city that must be taken in the cause of Christ. We vote the sermon on Mary as one of the very best we have seen on the subject.

George B. MacDonald.

**Christ's Memorial.** Monroe E. Dodd. Nashville: The Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention. 1934. Pp. 102. $1.25.

A series of evaluational and devotional meditations centering about the Lord's Supper. They are imaginative, suggestive, and sometimes beautiful.

**Farmers, Where Are We Going?** George A. Nelson. Chicago: Socialist Party National Headquarters. 1934. Pp. 16. 10 cents.

George A. Nelson, Socialist candidate for Governor of Wisconsin, 1934, speaks from the farmer's point of view in this Socialist publication. It is true, he says, that by loans the Federal Government attempts to help the farmer. Do such loans help the farmer? No. These loans only postpone the final day of reckoning and do not improve his general circumstances. By buying produce in the open market the government attempted to raise the price of farm products. When they stopped buying the price dropped back to the original low level. What was the result of this program? The farmer owed more money, farm prices continued to drop and the industrial panic which started in 1929 served as a crisis which pushed farming into bankruptcy. The administrators of the New Deal have continued this sort of aid. They have attempted to help the farmer by lending him more money, and reducing his crops. The only way out for the farmer is by organization. He must join hands with other workers to work for the common good of all.

**The Balliols.** Alec Waugh. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc. 1934. Pp. 547. $2.50.

This volume portrays events of the past three decades, and the influence they have had upon contemporary life and thought. The author selects as his subject a middle-class English family of London, and describes the experiences of each member through these turbulent years. The changes that take place reflect a general

movement toward new and untried ways of social relationships. As old restraints give way, due chiefly to the influences of the war, their effects are reflected in the life of the Balliol family. Those who are interested in a popular interpretation of the last thirty years in England will find this book well suited to the purpose.

---

# BOOKS RECEIVED

THE EPIC FAST. Pyarelal. New York: Universal Publishing Co. 1934. Pp. xii, 328. $1.00.

CONDITION OF INDIA. Report of the Delegation sent to India by the India League. New York: Universal Publishing Co. 1934. Pp. xv, 534. $1.50.

JOHN BUNYAN MECHANICK PREACHER. William York Tindall. New York: Columbia University Press. 1934. Pp. xiv, 309. $3.50.

A HISTORY OF MAGIC AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCE. Lynn Thorndike. New York, Vols. 3 and 4. 1934. Pp. xxvi, 827. xviii, 767. $10.00.

NEW RELATIONSHIPS WITH JEWS AND CATHOLICS. Discussion Outlined for Protestant Groups. Mrs. Abel J. Gregg. New York: Association Press. 1934. Pp. 64. Paper, 25 cents.

EDUCATION FOR LIFE WITH GOD. Wilfred Evans Powell. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 264. $2.00.

CHRISTIANITY AS HISTORY AND FAITH. Arthur Cushman McGiffert. Edited by A. C. McGiffert, Jr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. xiv, 322. $2.50.

IF A MAN DIE. W. Cosby Bell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. xviii, 199. $1.75.

RELIGION AND COMMUNISM. Julius F. Hecker. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1934. Pp. xii, 303. $3.00.

PHILOSOPHERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES. T. V. Smith. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1934. Pp. xxiv, 800. $4.50.

WITHOUT COMPROMISE. W. Brooke Stabler. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 135. $1.00.

DEADLY SINS AND LIVING VIRTUES. T. H. Wright. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. x, 116. $1.50.

THE AGE OF CONFIDENCE. Henry Seidel Canby. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1934. Pp. 260. $2.50.

INTOLERANCE. Winfred Ernest Garrison. New York: Round Table Press. 1934. Pp. xv, 270. $2.50.

PREACHING AND THE MIND OF TODAY. Glenn Gaius Atkins. New York: Round Table Press. 1934. Pp. xvi, 227. $2.00.

URBAN ORGANIZATION OF PROTESTANTISM. Wilbur C. Hallenback. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xii, 285. $1.50.

SADHU SUNDAR SINGH. Charles F. Andrews. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xvi, 205. $2.00.

THE MEDIATOR. Emil Brunner. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. 622. $6.50.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN DISSENT. John M. Mecklin. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1934. Pp. 381. $3.50.

THE CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO. Edwin Lewis. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 245. $2.00.

THE MEANING OF MARX. Sidney Hook. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1934. Pp. vi, 144. $1.00.

FRIENDS OF GOD. Anna Groh Seesholtz. New York: Columbia University Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 247. $2.50.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. viii, 230. $3.00.

GOD AND THIS TROUBLED WORLD. W. R. Matthews. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc. 1934. Pp. xvii, 243. $2.50.

THE GAME OF LIFE. John J. Lanier. Fredericksburg, Va.: By the Author. 1934. Pp. 88.

DRAMA IN THE CHURCH. Fred Eastman and Louis Wilson. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co. 1934. Pp. xi, 197. $1.50.

A NATURAL APPROACH TO PHILOSOPHY. Lewis Guy Rohrbaugh. New York: Noble and Noble. 1934. Pp. xiv, 481. $2.50.

INDIAN CONCEPTIONS OF IMMORTALITY. Walter E. Clark. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1934. Pp. 49. $1.00.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT. Edited by William H. Leach. Nashville, Tenn.: Cokesbury Press. 1934. Pp. 222. $1.50.

THE SECRET OF VICTORIOUS LIVING. Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. viii, 246. $1.50.

REALISTIC THEOLOGY. Walter Marshall Horton. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xi, 207. $2.00.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL PROCESS. Shailer Mathews. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. viii, 221. $2.00.

THE REFINERS FIRE. J. W. G. Ward. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. 124. $1.00.

ZEUS BENTLEY. Joseph D. Parker. Boston, Mass.: Meador Publishing Co. 1934. Pp. 190. $2.00.

CHRIST AND EVOLUTION. George A. Barton. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press. 1934. Pp. xi, 166. $2.00.

DIVINE WHITE RIGHT. Trevor Bowen. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xiii, 310. $1.75.

CATHOLICS, JEWS AND PROTESTANTS. Claris Edwin Silcox and Galen M. Fisher. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xvi, 369. $2.50.

THE ANCESTRY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE. (Ninth edition, revised.) Ira Maurice Price. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. xxvi, 350. $2.50.

WHEN GOD HIDES. Paul E. Sherer. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1934. Pp. vii, 90. $1.00.

BEGINNING THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. G. Pitt Beers. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. Pp. 20. 15 cents.

JESUS AND THE LIBERAL MIND. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Jr. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1934. Pp. xiv, 237. $1.00.

FOR SUCH A TIME AS THIS. Addresses at the Northern Baptist Convention. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1934. Pp. viii, 119. Paper, 30 cents.